Development: Remittances [77]
Commitment [#77]
“We will work to reduce the average cost of transferring remittances from 10 per cent to 5 per cent by 2014, contributing to release an additional 15 billion USD per year for recipient families.”

Cannes Summit Document

Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Lack of Compliance</th>
<th>Work in Progress</th>
<th>Full Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background:
Remittance transfers are defined as “cross-border person-to-person payments of relatively low value. In practice, the transfers are typically recurrent payments by migrant workers.”

In 2011 remittance flows to developing regions rose for the first time since the 2008 financial crisis. Persistently high unemployment and unpredictable exchange rates present risks to the future growth of remittances flows by making them volatile and uncertain.

---


The first commitment specifically addressing remittances was made at the 2004 G8 Sea Island Summit. At the Summit, the G8 leaders launched the Global Remittances Initiative with the World Bank. This initiative committed to reduce the cost of transferring remittances and facilitate transactions.\(^{1471}\)

In 2007, the G8 and Outreach 5 held a high-level meeting on remittances in Berlin to review the actions agreed at the Sea Island Summit. The participants underscored the need to advance the Sea Island remittance commitments. They encouraged bilateral and multilateral actions to improve financial services through innovative payment instruments. At this meeting, the G8 + 5 requested that the World Bank assist in coordinating international actions. The World Bank introduced the General Principles for Remittance Services as a guide for policymakers to achieve safe and efficient international remittance transfer services.\(^{1472}\) Participants also encouraged the creation of a Global Remittance Working Group to monitor the G8+5’s progress in lowering remittance costs.\(^{1473}\) These recommendations were officially adopted at the 2008 Hokkaido Summit.\(^{1474}\)

At the L’Aquila Summit, the G8 introduced the 5x5 Objective to lower the cost of remittance transfers by 5% in 5 years. They committed to enhancing transparency and competition among remittance service providers in order to halve remittance costs in Africa.\(^{1475}\)

In 2010, at the G20 Seoul Summit, the issue of remittances was discussed. The Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth declared a need to lower the average cost of remittance transfers to improve income resilience in developing nations.\(^{1476}\)

**Commitment Features:**

The World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide portal divides all countries in two groups: remittance sending and receiving countries.\(^{1477}\)

Sending countries include: Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Russia, UK, and the US.


\(^{1476}\) Seoul Development Consensus for Shared Growth, G20 Information Centre (Toronto) 27 June 2010. Date of Access: 6 February 2012. [www.g20.utoronto.ca/2010/g20seoul-consensus.pdf](http://www.g20.utoronto.ca/2010/g20seoul-consensus.pdf)

Receiving countries include: China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Turkey, Argentina, Korea, South Africa, and Brazil.

Given this distinction, compliance is evaluated differently between the sending and receiving groups. It is to be noted that countries that are both sending and receiving countries, such Korea, South Africa, and Brazil, will be scored using the guidelines for sending countries.

I. Sending countries:
This report considers Australia, Brazil, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, UK, and the US to be sending countries. G20 members have committed to reducing average transfer costs from 10% to 5% by 2014.

Figure 1 shows the change in average costs from Q3 2011 to Q1 2012 for sender countries to remit to all receiving countries in accordance with established “country corridors.”

![Figure 1: Change in Remittance Costs (Sending)](image)


Compliance to this commitment will be evaluated in three parts; a sending country is considered on track towards full compliance if it: (1) currently has average transfer costs valued at below 10% for USD200 and USD500 dollar transfer amounts OR (2) reduced outgoing transfer costs for remittances OR (3) enacted policy that advances the World Bank General Principles for International Remittance Services.

Part 1: Below world average transfer cost of 10%
Average outgoing transfer costs are determined using data provided by the World Bank Remittance prices portal, which monitors changes in remittance prices of 212 “country corridors” worldwide. The remittance prices portal summarizes how much it costs, on average, to send

---


money from one country to another.\textsuperscript{1481} Remittance prices are calculated based on local-currency equivalent transfer amounts of USD200 and USD500 respectively.\textsuperscript{1482}

Sending countries with average transfer costs under the global average 10\% for both USD200 and USD500 transfer amounts are considered to be on track towards full compliance by 2014.

**Part 2: Change in remittance costs**

Changes in remittance prices is determined using data provided by the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, which monitors changes in remittance prices of 212 “country corridors” worldwide.

**Methodology:** The G20 Research Group aggregates and averages remittance transfer costs from a sending country to all receiving countries in accordance with the available “country corridors” in order to determine the outgoing transfer cost in a given time period. It then compares the average transfer cost of the latest available period \( t \) to that of an earlier period \( t-1 \) to determine changes to prices over time.

For the Cannes Summit cycle, changes in remittance costs between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012 will be considered for compliance. It is to be noted that any changes to the average transfer cost that are less than 0.1\% will be considered insubstantial and will not be considered for scoring.

Sending countries whose average outgoing transfer costs fell from the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012 are considered on track towards full compliance by 2014.

**Part 3: World Bank General Principles for International Remittance Services**

The World Bank Principles for International Remittance Services outlines five principles for reducing the cost of remittance transfers. It recommends that countries: improve transparency and consumer protection; improve payment system infrastructure; support a sound and non-discriminatory legal and regulatory framework in relevant jurisdictions; foster competitive market conditions; and support appropriate governance and risk management practices for remittance services.\textsuperscript{1483} A country is considered on track towards full compliance by 2014 if it implements policies consistent with at least one of the five World Bank General Principles.

**Scoring Guidelines for Sending Countries:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not demonstrate intent* to reduce remittance costs OR enact policies consistent with at least one of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member demonstrated intent* to reduce remittance costs OR enact policies consistent with at least one of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member’s average transfer costs are below the global average of 10% for USD200 and USD500 transfer amounts OR member reduces remittance costs OR enacts policies consistent with at least one of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*A country demonstrates intent by making official announcements, speeches, pledges, reports, sponsoring and publishing relevant studies, and proposing policies and frameworks within the Cannes compliance cycle

II. Receiving countries:
This report considers China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Turkey, and Argentina to be receiving countries.

Receiving countries play a role in fostering a favourable receiving environment for remittances. Poor receiving environments can present an obstacle to the reduction of remittance transfer costs. While the World Bank database provides statistics on the cost to receive remittances from a number of sending countries, many receiving countries have only one country corridor. A sufficient number of datapoints (above one) is needed to ensure that the measurements accurately resemble the sample mean, and are not simply outliers. Given insufficient data on the receiving countries, to proceed with any meaningful analysis, this report will only be looking at sending countries in its evaluation of price fluctuations. Thus, for the purposes of this compliance report, fluctuations in transaction costs from sending country (ies) to a receiving country will be neglected. [This methodology may change in the future if more datapoints could be obtained for receiving countries]

For receiving countries, full compliance is awarded if a country has enacted policies that aim to reduce transaction cost or that advance the World Bank General Principles for International Remittance Services.\textsuperscript{1484}

**Figure 2: Change in Remittance Costs (Receiving)**
Figure 2 shows the change in average costs from Q3 2011 to Q1 2012 for all sender countries to remit to the following receiving countries in accordance with established “country corridors.”

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{remittance_costs.png}
\caption{Change in Remittance Costs (Receiving)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{1485} Source: World Bank Remittance Prices Worldwide (2012)\textsuperscript{1485}


Scoring Guidelines for Receiving Countries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Member does not demonstrate intent* to reduce remittance costs OR enact policies consistent with at least one of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Member demonstrates intent* to reduce remittance costs OR enact policies consistent with at least one of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>Member enacts policies to reduce remittance costs OR enacts policies that are consistent with at least one of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A country demonstrates intent by making official announcements, speeches, pledges, reports, sponsoring and publishing relevant studies, and proposing policies and frameworks within the Cannes compliance cycle.

[NB: The Cannes compliance cycle spans from 4 November 2011 to 1 June 2012. Thus, any policies enacted prior to 4 November 2011 do not count towards scoring.]

Lead Analyst: Vanessa Guidorizzi, Hermonie Xie

Argentina: -1
Arkentina has not demonstrated intent to reduce remittance costs or enact policies consistent with the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services. Thus, it received a score of -1.

Analyst: Rezwana Islam

Australia: 0
Australia has demonstrated intent to reduce remittance costs.

Australia’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued above the global average at 11.51% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Australia’s average transfer cost is below the global average at 7.22%.

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Australia’s outgoing transfer costs have risen. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.02% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012. For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.76% in the same period.

On 26 October 2011, Foreign Minister Kevin Rudd speaking in Perth at a Pacific Island Foreign Ministers Breakfast announced an AUD3.5 million package supporting Commonwealth developing countries to drive down the costs of remittances over the next 2 years. The package...

---

“supports target countries in setting up their own mechanisms to increase transparency and competition in the remittance services market.”

As of 1 November 2011, new registration requirements were imposed on providers of remittance services by the Australian government. The Australian Transaction and Analysis Centre was the body designated to supervise these measures, which are aimed at increasing the transparency of remittance network providers, remittance network affiliates, and independent remittance dealers.

On 4 November 2011, during a press conference in Cannes, Prime Minister Julia Gillard revealed that she spearheaded the remittance question during G20 discussions and emphasized her commitment to ensure that “people who are earning money can send it to their families back home and not lose too much on the transaction.”

Thus, for demonstrating intent to reduce remittance costs, Australia has received a score of 0.

**Analyst: Julia Deutsch**

**Brazil: 0**

Brazil demonstrated intent to enact the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services nationally.

Brazil’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued above the global average at 13.13% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Brazil’s average transfer cost is below the global average at 7.97%.

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Brazil’s outgoing transfer costs have risen. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 2.22% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012. For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 1.9% in the same period.

---


On 19 February 2012, the Central Bank of Brazil issued a communiqué to its employees and subsidiaries reaffirming its commitment to provide fast, reliable and transparent remittance transfers.\textsuperscript{1497}

Thus Brazil has been awarded of 0 for its promotion of World Bank General Principles on remittance transfers.

\textit{Analyst: Vanessa Guidorizzi}

**Canada: +1**

Canada has reduced the cost of remittance transfers.

Canada’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued above the global average at 12.78\% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Canada’s average transfer cost is below the global average at 6.88\%.\textsuperscript{1498}

Canada entered into partnerships with India\textsuperscript{1499} in 2004, and Jamaica\textsuperscript{1500} in 2005, to facilitate the transfer of remittances by reducing cost and removing legislative barriers.\textsuperscript{1501} Since then, no new partnerships or policies regarding remittances have been implemented.

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Canada’s outgoing transfer costs have fallen. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.72\% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012.\textsuperscript{1502} For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.58\% in the same period.\textsuperscript{1503}

Thus, Canada received a score of +1 for reducing the cost of remittance transfers.

\textit{Analyst: Kevin Hong}

\textsuperscript{1497} Gerência de Manual, Banco Central Do Brasil (Brasília) 19 February 2012. Date Accessed: 1 March 2012. 
\textsuperscript{1500} Canada and Jamaica to Encourage Low-Cost Remittance Services, Department of Finance Canada (Ottawa) 14 April 2005. Date of Access: 4 March 2012. http://www.fin.gc.ca/n05/05-027-eng.asp
China: 0
China demonstrated intent to enact policies consistent with World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services.

In January 2012, the statistics department of the People’s Bank of China (PBOC) noted in a report that China has a “strategic opportunity” presently to relax restrictions on capital flows.\(^{1504}\) In February 2012, the People’s Bank of China published its fourth-quarter monetary policy report in which it expressed intent to ‘explore’ cross-border capital transactions in Chinese Yuan.\(^{1505}\) The government has yet to formulate a method for easing controls on cross border capital flows.\(^{1506}\) These initiatives, if implemented, would improve access to domestic payment infrastructures and are consistent with General Principle 4 of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services.

Thus, for demonstrating intent to enact policies consistent with World Bank General Principles, China received a score of 0.

Analyst: Oluwaseun Onasanya

France: 0
France has demonstrated intent to enact policy for reducing remittance costs.

On 21 February 2012, France’s Minister for Cooperation, Henri de Raincourt, led a group of officials to attend a conference hosted by Kamal Elkeshen, Vice President of the African Development Bank (ADB), on money transfers to Africa from migrants.\(^{1507}\) The conference discussed in detail a series of recommendations made by a study on reducing the cost of remittances by the credit institution Epargne sans Frontières and co-financed by the ADB and the French Development Agency.\(^{1508}\) The study recommended a process called “bi-banking” which stipulates coordination between the banks in sending and receiving countries and suggested the development of: (1) new financial products, (2) new technology for electronic transfers, and (3) legal and regulatory frameworks.\(^{1509}\) At the conclusion of the conference, France reaffirmed its

---


commitment to continue on this path and encouraged officials to work towards implementing recommendations made by the study.\textsuperscript{1510} France’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued above the global average at 13.45\% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, France’s average transfer cost is below the global average at 6.71\%.\textsuperscript{1511}

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, France’s outgoing transfer costs did not change significantly. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.03\% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012.\textsuperscript{1512} For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.08\% in the same period.\textsuperscript{1513}

Thus, France received a score of 0 for demonstrating intent to enact policy for reducing remittance costs.

\textit{Analyst: Julia Deutsch}

\textbf{Germany: -1}

Germany did not demonstrate intent to reduce remittance costs or enact policy consistent with World Bank General Principles.

Germany’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued above the global average at 13.74\% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Germany’s average transfer cost is below the global average at 6.76\%.\textsuperscript{1514}

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Germany’s outgoing transfer costs rose for smaller transfer amounts and did not change significantly for larger amounts. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.5\% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012.\textsuperscript{1515} For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.08\% in the same period.\textsuperscript{1516}

Thus, Germany received a score of -1 for failing to demonstrate intent to reduce costs or enact policy consistent with World Bank General Principles.

\textit{Analyst: Oluwaseun Onasanya}

---


India: +1
India has enacted policy for reducing remittance costs.

On 29 March 2012, The Bank of India signed a service agreement with TimesofMoney, a Mumbai-based digital payment service provider, to offer technology-driven remittance services to non-resident Indians in the UK. The initiative aims to provide a fast, secure, and cost effective way to remit money to India.\(^{1517}\)

Thus, India received a score of +1 for enacting policy for reducing remittance costs.

Analyst: Rezwana Islam

Indonesia: 0
Indonesia has demonstrated intent to determine policies that reduce remittance costs.

On 5 December 2006, the Indonesian central bank introduced new regulation dealing with remittances sent through non-bank financial institutions. Due to the lower administrative costs of non-bank financial institutions, the regulation was created “to provide greater assurance in the areas of security, transparency, legal protection and customer protection.”\(^{1518}\) Since then, Indonesia has not implemented any further policies to reduce remittance prices.

On 2 April 2012 at the 7\(^{th}\) ASEAN Economic Community (AEC) Council meeting, the Indonesian minister of trade announced that Indonesia would be facilitating an AEC forum later in the year to discuss the best practices of financial inclusion and improving the flow of remittances.\(^{1519}\)

Thus, Indonesia received a score of 0 for demonstrating intent to reduce costs or enact policy consistent with World Bank General Principles.

Analyst: Kevin Hong

Italy: +1
Italy has met its target of a 5% or lower average transfer cost for a remittance amount of USD500 dollars. It has reduced the cost of remittance transfers and its average transfer costs are substantially below the global average of 10% for a USD200 dollar transfer amount.

\(^{1517}\) Bank of India and TimesofMoney join hands to provide online money transfer service NRIs in UK, The Economic Times (Mumbai) 29 March 2012. Date of Access: 8 April 2012.

\(^{1518}\) BI Issues Regulation On Money Remittances, Bank Indonesia (Jakarta) 15 December 2006. Date of Access: 4 March 2012.

\(^{1519}\) The 7th AEC Council Meeting: Consolidation towards ASEAN Economic Community 2015, Ministry of Trade of the Republic of Indonesia (Jakarta) 2 April 2012. Date of Access: 29 April 2012.
Italy’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued below the global average at 7.92% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Italy’s average transfer cost is valued below the G20 target at 4.77%.\(^{1520}\)

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Italy’s outgoing transfer costs have fallen. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.19% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012.\(^{1521}\) For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.3% in the same period.\(^{1522}\)

On 2 March 2012, the Government of Italy introduced a tax simplification decree that repealed the 2% tax on remittances sent by undocumented residents in Italy.\(^{1523}\)

Thus, Italy received a score of +1 for reducing the cost of remittance transfers.

**Analyst: Kevin Hong**

### Japan: +1

Japan has reduced the cost of remittance transfers.

Japan’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued above the global average at 15.84% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Japan’s average transfer cost is below the global average at 7.33%.\(^{1524}\)

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Japan’s outgoing transfer costs have fallen. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 1% between the third quarter of 2011 and the fourth quarter of 2012.\(^{1525}\) For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.61% in the same period.\(^{1526}\)

Thus, Japan received a score of +1 for reducing the cost of remittance transfers.

**Analyst: Ahmed Al-Sa’d**

### Korea: +1

Korea has met its target of a 5% or lower average transfer cost for a remittance amount of USD500 dollars. For a USD200 dollar transfer amount, Korea’s average transfer costs are


substantially below the global average. In addition, Korea demonstrated intent to enact policy consistent with World Bank General Principles.

Korea’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued below the global average at 6.78% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Korea’s average transfer cost is valued below the G20 target at 3.75%.  

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Korea outgoing transfer costs have risen. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.32% between the third quarter of 2011 and the fourth quarter of 2012. For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.6% in the same period.

On 30 January 2012, Korean government officials from the Banker’s Association and from the Financial Supervisory service declared that they were working with banks both within and outside the country to reduce remittance charges in Korea so that foreigners can easily use banking services. This initiative is improves access to financial services and is consistent with General Principle 2 of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services.

Thus, Korea received a score of +1 for having average transfer costs substantially below the global average and for demonstrating intent to enact policy consistent with World Bank General Principles.

**Analyst: Oluwaseun Onasanya**

**Mexico: -1**

Mexico has not demonstrated intent to reduce remittance costs or enact policies consistent with World Bank General Principles.

However, it is to be noted that Article 41 of the Mexican Constitution forbids “the dissemination of all government propaganda in the media” during electoral campaigns. As a result, access to information about government programs, actions, works or achievements are restricted during the period of 30 March to 1 July 2012 and may distort scoring.

Thus, Mexico received a score of -1 for failing to demonstrate intent to reduce costs or enact policies consistent with World Bank General Principles.

**Analyst: Rezwana Islam**

---


**Russia: +1**

Russia has fully complied with its commitment to reduce the average cost of transferring remittances.

Russia’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued below the G20 target at 2.5% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Russia’s average transfer cost is valued below the G20 target at 2.5%.  

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Russia’s outgoing transfer costs for a transfer amount of USD200 fell by 0.41% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012. For a transfer amount of USD500, prices also fell by 0.4% in the same period.

On 24 December 2011, provisions of the Federal Law On the National Payment System regulating the procedures for rendering payment services came into force. The law provides for improving transparency and consumer protection of remittance services, including through the requirement of disclosing fees and exchange rate data by providers.

Thus, Russia receives a score of +1 for full compliance with its commitment on remittance transfers.

*Analyst: Andrey Shelepov*

**Saudi Arabia: +1**

Saudi Arabia has met its target of a 5% or lower average transfer cost for both USD200 dollar and USD500 dollar transfer amounts.

Saudi Arabia’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued below the G20 target at 4.18% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, Saudi Arabia’s average transfer cost is valued below the G20 target at 2.49%.

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, Saudi Arabia’s outgoing transfer costs did not change significantly for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars, and rose for a transfer amount of USD500 dollars. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.08% between the third quarter of 2011 and the first quarter of 2012. For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.26% in the same period.

---


On 21 March 2012, the Dammam-based Al-Sharq newspaper quoted an informed force at the Labour Ministry revealing that the ministry was coordinating with ministries of Interior and Finance to lay down rules and regulations that would “reduce the large amounts of financial remittances foreigners annually make to the outside.” If the initiative is enacted, it could make it more costly to remit from Saudi Arabia.

Thus, Saudi Arabia receives a score of +1 for having average costs lower than the the G20 target of 5%.

Analyst: Ahmed Al-Sa’d

South Africa: + 1

South Africa reduced average transfer costs for remittance amounts of USD500 dollars, and announced reforms consistent with the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services in its Medium Term Budget Policy Statement.

South Africa’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued above the global average at 17.7% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, South Africa’s average transfer cost is valued slightly above the global average at 10.14%.

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, South Africa’s outgoing transfer costs rose for smaller transfer amounts and fell for larger transfer amounts. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.62% between the third quarter of 2011 and the fourth quarter of 2012. For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 1.1% in the same period.

On 25 October 2011, the Minister of Finance announced that it will enact policies that comply with the following World Bank General Guidelines: (1) improvement of the payment system infrastructure, and (2) fostering competitive market conditions. In order to reduce costs of remittances, South Africa will remove ownership restrictions on international participation in Authorised Dealers in Foreign Exchange with Limited Authority. In addition, it will no longer be compulsory for remittance agencies to partner with existing authorised dealers. This proposal is still undergoing regulatory and reporting requirements and has not yet been implemented.

1539 Ministries eyeing means to curb foreigners’ remittances, Arab News (Jeddah) 22 March 2012. http://arabnews.com/saudiarabia/article591426.ece
Thus South Africa has been awarded a score of +1 for reducing average costs for larger transfer amounts, and for beginning to implement reforms that facilitate remittance transfers.

Analyst: Atifa Hasham

Turkey: -1
Turkey has not demonstrated intent to reduce remittance costs or enact policies consistent with the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services. Thus, it received a score of -1.

Analyst: Julia Deutsch

United Kingdom: +1
The United Kingdom has average transfer costs below the global average for both USD200 and USD500 transfer amounts.

The United Kingdom’s average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued below the global average at 8.16% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, the UK’s average transfer cost is valued slightly above the G20 target at 5.88%.1546

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, the UK’s outgoing transfer costs did not change significantly for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars, and rose for a transfer amount of USD500 dollars. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.01% between the third quarter of 2011 and the fourth quarter of 2012.1547 For a remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.41% in the same period.1548

Since 2009, the United Kingdom has implemented policies to facilitate the transfer of international funds, while also attempting to minimize criminal activity. In November 2009, the United Kingdom adopted the Payment Services Directive (PSD), which aimed to standardize intra-Europe payment services.1549 In accordance with the PSD, the UK underwent a transition period in which Money Service Businesses were required to apply to become a Payments Institution (PI) at the Financial Services Authority for Authorization and Regulation. This allowed Money Service Businesses to bypass any extensive local regulatory procedures within the European Economic Area. On the other hand, banks, building societies, authorized e-money issuers, small e-money issuers, Post Office Limited, and specific public bodies, are able to provide services without having to register under the PSD. The PSD is consistent with the following World Bank General Principles: (1) improving transparency and consumer protection; (3) fostering competitive market conditions; and (4) improvement of the payment system.1551

---


On 30 April 2011, the UK implemented the second Electronic Money Directive, which aims to encourage growth of the electronic money market.\footnote{Electronic Money Regulations, Financial Services Authority 4 January 2012. Date of Access: 11 March 2012. http://www.fsa.gov.uk/about/what/international/emoney} It is important to note that this legislation have major implications for cross-border mobile payments, particularly if a business is established an e-Money issuer as it will then be able to offer all the services of a payment institution.\footnote{Constraints in the UK to Ghana Remittance Market, Developing Markets Associates Ltd & Department of International Development 23 March 2011. Date of Access: 11 March 2012. http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Documents/publications1/Constraints-UK-Ghana.pdf} This initiative is improves access to financial services and is consistent with General Principle 2.

Thus, the UK received a score of +1 since its average costs for both USD200 and USD500 transfer amounts are below the global average of 10%.

\textit{Analyst: Atifa Hasham}

\textbf{United States: +1}

The United States has met its target of a 5% or lower average transfer cost for a remittance amount of USD500 dollars. Its average transfer costs are substantially below the global average of 10% for a USD200 dollar transfer amount. In addition, the United States is in the process of enacting an amendment to Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E) that is consistent with the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services and will be implemented by February 2013.\footnote{Electric Fund Transfers, Federal Register 7 February 2012. Date of Access: 11 March 2012. https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2012/02/07/2012-1728/electronic-fund-transfers-regulation-e#p-3}

The United States average transfer cost for the first quarter of 2012 is valued below the global average at 7.11% for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars. For a transfer amount of USD500 dollars, the United States’ average transfer cost has met the G20 target at 5.02%.\footnote{Remittance Prices Worldwide, World Bank (Washington) 2012. Date of Access: 7 April 2012. http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/}

According to the World Bank Remittance Prices portal, the United States’ outgoing transfer costs did not change significantly for a transfer amount of USD200 dollars, and rose for a transfer amount of USD500 dollars. For a remittance amount of USD200 dollars, average transfer costs decreased by 0.08% between the third quarter of 2011 and the fourth quarter of 2012.\footnote{Remittance Prices Worldwide, World Bank (Washington) 2012. Date of Access: 7 April 2012. http://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/}
remittance amount of USD500 dollars, average transfer costs increased by 0.2% in the same period.\textsuperscript{1558}

On 21 July 2010, President Obama signed the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act,\textsuperscript{1559} which provides new federal regulations and oversight for consumer remittance providers. In particular, the Act demands the disclosure of remittance costs and the establishment of consumer rights in the case of an error. The new Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) enforces these new protections, while the Federal Reserve Board works to expand the use of the automated clearinghouse system, as well as other payment mechanisms.\textsuperscript{1560}

Currently, the CFPB, the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Reserve Banks, and the Department of the Treasury are working to implement the provisions set out by the Dodd-Frank Act.\textsuperscript{1561} The Federal Reserve Board has worked on a proposed remittance transfer regulation so that providers will be required to disclose information about fees, exchange rates, and the amount of money to be delivered to senders.\textsuperscript{1562} In addition, this proposal will allow for error resolution and cancellation rights for senders, and will include many types of transfers. Under the CFPB, this proposal is more specifically known as the amendment to Electronic Fund Transfers (Regulation E), which will formally implement the Electronic Transfer Act. The amendment has entered the third and final phase of its agenda, and is still seeking public comment. The rules will be effective 7 February 2013.\textsuperscript{1563}

On 26 March 2012, Nick Rathod released a statement reiterating this commitment to adopt new rules set by the CFPB that will make remittance costs clearer and hold transfer providers accountable for error.\textsuperscript{1564}

Thus, the United States received a score of +1 for having average transfer costs below the global average for a remittance amount of USD200 and USD500 dollars.

\textit{Analyst: Atifa Hasham}

European Union: N/A
The European Union cannot be scored for this commitment because changes in average remittance transfers varies across member states. That being said, the European Commission has a number of initiatives in place that aim to reduce remittance costs and are consistent with World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services.

Since 2010, Eurostat regularly publishes data on EU remittances.\textsuperscript{1565} As part of its annual accountability report on Financing for Development, the European Commission produces information on the initiatives implemented in the field of financial transfers of migrants across the EU.\textsuperscript{1566} These initiatives improve transparency and consumer protection, payment systems, and market competition and are consistent with General Principles 1, 3, and 4 of the World Bank’s Principles for International Remittance Services.

The EU Payment Services Directive (PSD) provides the legal basis of a single European market for payments and intends to promote competition and strengthen transparency in the market.\textsuperscript{1567} The PSD creates legal obligations that govern intra-EU capital transfers, but some EU members have extended the laws to apply to agents outside the EU and to transfers in non-European currencies.\textsuperscript{1568} This initiative enhances transparency and improves access to formal financial services and is consistent with General Principles 1 and 2.

Starting from April 2011, the Directive on Electronic Money allows electronic money institutions, such as telecom providers or companies providing prepaid cards, to conduct intra-EU financial transfers.\textsuperscript{1569} This initiative improves access to financial services and is consistent with General Principle 2.

\textit{Analyst: Ahmed Al-Sa’d}
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