



## International Comparison Program 2021

# Global Highlights

The International Comparison Program (ICP) provides a global public good crucial to socioeconomic analyses as we reach the quarter century in the new millennium. The results of the ICP 2021 cycle include purchasing power parities<sup>1</sup> (PPPs), price level indexes (PLIs), comparable volume and per capita measures of gross domestic product (GDP), actual individual consumption, and 43 other expenditure components. These data are benchmarked to the reference year 2021 and cover the cycle's 176 participating economies. Revised results for the previous ICP reference year, 2017, and PPPs for six major headings for 2018 to 2020 have also been published. In addition, extrapolated GDP PPPs for 2022 and 2023 are released for the first time, providing a comprehensive and up-to-date view of the global economic landscape.

PPPs convert different currencies to a common currency and, in the process of conversion, equalize their purchasing power by controlling for differences in the price levels of goods and services between economies. PPPs allow international comparisons of GDP and its components that avoid the over- or under-estimation of economic output that is inherent in market exchange rate-based comparisons, as the latter does not adjust for price levels. PPP-based estimates are also not prone to fluctuations in market exchange rates. PPPs are calculated by the ICP based on the prices of items within a common basket of goods and services and expenditure shares, used as expenditure weights, on groups of items in each of the participating economies.<sup>2</sup>

The major messages and highlights of the results are shown below.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> PPPs are statistical estimates and should be treated as approximations of true values, subject to sampling, measurement, and classification errors. They should not be used as indicators of currency under- or overvaluation. ICP Results are based on data supplied by participating economies to the global and regional implementing agencies, and produced in accordance with the ICP methodology. ICP results are not deemed to be national official statistics.

<sup>2</sup> The standard ICP methodology has been maintained between the two most recent 2017 and 2021 ICP cycles. However, in ICP 2021, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region was linked through the standard global core list approach, unlike in ICP 2017, when the CIS region was linked through the Russian Federation, which participated in both the OECD and CIS comparisons. For ICP 2017, the Russian Federation's results are based on the OECD comparison, and for ICP 2021, they are based on the CIS comparison. Furthermore, the Asia and Pacific region moved to the standard ICP approach for estimating housing PPPs based on rental and volume data during the ICP 2021 cycle. The standard approach was utilized for the revised ICP 2017 results and ICP 2021 results, both at the regional and global levels, instead of the previously utilized reference volume approach.

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all indicators are based on PPPs. Market exchange rate-based measures are explicitly noted.

## Global economy

- The global economy was \$152.4 trillion when measured in PPP terms.
- The largest economy in the world in 2021 was China, recording a PPP-based GDP of \$28.8 trillion, reflecting 18.9 percent of the global GDP. The United States was the second largest, with nearly \$23.6 trillion or 15.5 percent of the global GDP. India's economy was the third largest at \$11.0 trillion, accounting for 7.2 percent.
- Also in the ten largest economies group were the Russian Federation (\$5.7 trillion and 3.8 percent), Japan (\$5.6 trillion and 3.7 percent), Germany (\$5.2 trillion and 3.4 percent), Brazil (\$3.7 trillion and 2.4 percent), France (\$3.6 trillion and 2.4 percent), the United Kingdom (\$3.5 trillion and 2.3 percent), and Indonesia (\$3.5 trillion and 2.3 percent).
- The **East Asia and Pacific region** accounted for 32.7 percent of PPP-based global GDP, and China contributed over half of this. Japan was the second-largest economy in the region, with a GDP of \$5.6 trillion.
- The **Europe and Central Asia region** contributed 25.6 percent of global output, with the Russian Federation at \$5.7 trillion and Germany at \$5.2 trillion being the largest economies in the region. Together, the two countries contributed 28 percent of the region's GDP.
- Brazil, at \$3.7 trillion, and Mexico, at \$2.7 trillion, were the two largest economies in the **Latin America and the Caribbean region**. Together, they contributed 57 percent of the region's GDP, which, in turn, contributed 7.3 percent of the global GDP.
- In the **Middle East and North Africa region**, the Arab Republic of Egypt was the biggest economy at \$1.9 trillion, with Saudi Arabia being slightly smaller at \$1.7 trillion. The region accounted for 4.8 percent of global GDP.
- The **North American region** accounted for 16.9 percent of global GDP and 4.9 percent of the global population. Of the three economies in that region, the United States contributed the most, 92 percent of the regional economy.
- The **South Asia region**, home to nearly a quarter of the world's population, accounted for 9.3 percent of global GDP. India, with a GDP of \$11.0 trillion, was the third largest economy in the world and contributed 77 percent of the regional output and 7.2 percent of the global output.
- The **Sub-Saharan Africa region** held the smallest regional share of global GDP at 3.5 percent while home to nearly 16 percent of the world's population. Nigeria was the largest economy, contributing 23 percent of the region's output, followed by South Africa at 16 percent.
- In terms of income groups, **high-income** economies were home to just 16 percent of the world's population but accounted for 46 percent of the PPP-based global GDP. **Upper-middle-income** economies' share of global PPP-based GDP was 35 percent, and the global population share was 33 percent. **Lower-middle-income** economies accounted for 18 percent of the PPP-based global GDP and 42 percent of the global population. **Low-income** economies, home to 8 percent of the global population, accounted for 1 percent of PPP-based GDP.
- In relation to the use of market exchange rate-based conversion factors vis-a-vis PPPs, the bias discussed above is most apparent when comparing income group shares of the world economy, as the exchange rate comparison inflates the global share of economies where prices are high, such as higher-income economies, and deflates the share where prices are low, as typically found in lower-income economies. This is demonstrated by comparing the 2021 market exchange rate-based shares of global GDP of high-income economies (63 percent), upper-middle-income economies (28 percent),

lower-middle-income economies (9 percent), and low-income economies (0.5%) with the PPP-based shares above.

### **GDP per capita**

- Nearly three in five people live in economies with a mean PPP-based GDP per capita below the \$20,271 world average.
- Luxembourg has the highest GDP per capita at \$137,948. Singapore, Ireland, and Qatar follow, each with a GDP per capita above \$100,000.
- Ten economies have a GDP per capita above \$70,000, collectively accounting for 4.8 percent of the world's population. The United States has the tenth highest GDP per capita at \$70,988, while China recorded \$20,407—just above the global mean.
- Four economies – Burundi, Central African Republic, Somalia, and Mozambique – had a GDP per capita of less than \$1,500.
- The index of GDP per capita sets the global mean at 100 and provides an indication of the global spread of income per person. Low-income economies averaged 12 on the index, or around a tenth of the global mean; lower-middle-income economies had an index value of 42, or just under half the global mean; upper-middle-income economies averaged 106, placing them just above the global mean; and high-income economies had an index value of 282.

### **Consumption per capita**

- The average material well-being of each economy's population is best measured by actual individual consumption (AIC) per capita; a measure of all expenditures in the economy that directly benefit individuals, whether they were paid for by the individuals themselves or by government or another entity. In 2021, around three-quarters of the global population lived in economies with a mean AIC per capita below the global average of \$12,948.
- The United States had the highest AIC per capita at \$52,654, followed by Luxembourg and Bermuda. The Democratic Republic of the Congo had the lowest AIC per capita at \$689, with the Central African Republic and Burundi slightly higher.
- Using the index of AIC per capita that sets the global average at 100, income groups range from 16 for low-income economies, or around one-sixth of the global average, to 291 for high-income economies, or around three times the world average.

### **Price levels**

- The Price Level Index (PLI) is the ratio of a PPP to its corresponding exchange rate. An index over 100 indicates prices are higher relative to the world average, while a PLI of less than 100 indicates lower prices.
- The most expensive economy in the world was Bermuda, with a GDP PLI of 194, followed by the Cayman Islands, Switzerland, Israel, Iceland, and Australia. The United States ranked ninth in the world with a GDP PLI of 158.
- High-income economies had a GDP PLI of 136, and an AIC PLI of 140. Upper-middle-income economies had a GDP PLI of 81 and an AIC PLI of 76. For lower-middle-income economies, the corresponding values were 48 and 45, while in low-income economies, the average GDP PLI was 50 and the average AIC PLI was 47.

## Individual consumption expenditures

- High-income, upper-middle-income, and lower-middle-income economies each accounted for around a third of the global expenditures on food and non-alcoholic beverages, while low-income economies contributed 3 percent.
- For health, high-income economies accounted for 55 percent of global expenditures, upper-middle income economies 30 percent, lower-middle income economies 15 percent, and low-income economies 0.5 percent.
- For education, both high-income and upper-middle income economies each accounted for 37 percent of global expenditures, lower-middle income economies 24 percent, and low-income economies 1 percent.
- For housing, water, electricity, gas, and other fuels, high-income economies accounted for 42 percent of global expenditures, upper-middle income economies 35 percent, lower-middle income economies 22 percent, and low-income economies 2 percent.
- For clothing and footwear, high-income economies accounted for 47 percent of global expenditures, upper-middle income economies 24 percent, lower-middle income economies 27 percent, and low-income economies 2 percent.

## Investment expenditures

- At 30 percent, China contributed the largest share of the world's expenditures on investment (as defined by gross fixed capital formation), followed by the United States at 13 percent. India, Japan, and Germany followed with 7 percent, 4 percent, and 3 percent respectively.
- Within East Asia and the Pacific, China accounted for about 68.4 percent of investment expenditures. Germany accounted for 12 percent of Europe and Central Asia, followed by the Russian Federation and France with 11.7 percent and 11.3 percent, respectively. Brazil contributed the largest share of the Latin America and the Caribbean region at 35 percent, followed by Mexico at 21 percent. Elsewhere, Saudi Arabia contributed the largest share of 33 percent in the Middle East and North Africa region, India accounted for 82 percent of the regional expenditure in South Asia, and Nigeria accounted for 30 percent of investment in Sub-Saharan Africa, followed by South Africa at 13 percent.
- On a per-capita basis, high-income economies spent 2.6 times the global average on investment, while upper-middle-income economies were slightly above the global average, lower-middle-income economies spent around a third, and low-income economies less than a tenth of the average global per capita investment expenditure.

## Government expenditures

- China had the largest share of global expenditures by government at 16 percent, accounting for half of all such spending in East Asia and Pacific. The United States had the second largest share of global expenditures by the government at 11 percent. The Europe and Central Asia region and the East Asia and Pacific region each contributed around a third of the global share at 34 percent and 31 percent, respectively.
- In high-income economies, the average per capita government expenditure was three times the global mean, while in upper-middle-income economies, the average per capita spending was slightly above the global mean. In lower-middle income economies and low-income economies, the average per capita government expenditure was around a third and a tenth of the global average, respectively.

## Revised ICP 2017 results

Results published in 2020 for the ICP reference year 2017 have been revised using updated 2017 expenditure, population, and market exchange rate data. The ICP is primarily designed to compare levels of economic activity across economies in a particular reference year. However, given that the methodology for the 2017 and 2021 cycles was kept mainly the same, and the set of economies participating in each cycle differed only slightly, it is possible to compare the results from the two years, albeit with some caution.<sup>4</sup>

- The global economy was \$121.9 trillion in 2017 when measured in 2017 PPP terms.
- In both 2017 and 2021, China was the largest economy in the world, followed by the United States and India. In 2017, China's share of global GDP was 16.9 percent of global GDP, and in 2021, it was 18.9 percent. The United States' share in 2017 was 16.1 percent, and 15.5 percent in 2021. India accounted for 6.7 percent of global GDP in 2017 and 7.2 percent in 2021. The Russian Federation's share increased from 3.1 percent to 3.8 percent, while Japan's economy share decreased from 4.3 percent to 3.7 percent, and Germany's share fell from 3.6 to 3.4 percent.
- The following regions increased their share of global GDP between 2017 and 2021: East Asia and the Pacific increased from 31.7 to 32.7 percent; Europe and Central Asia from 25.2 to 25.6 percent; South Asia from 8.6 percent to 9.3 percent; and a marginal rise for Sub-Saharan Africa from 3.3 percent to 3.5 percent. Of those regions whose shares fell, the Middle East and North Africa decreased from 6.0 percent of global GDP in 2017 to 4.8 percent in 2021, North America from 17.5 percent to 16.9 percent, and Latin America and the Caribbean from 7.6 percent to 7.3 percent.
- Price levels for GDP, AIC, investment, and government expenditures fell between 2017 and 2021 in Europe and Central Asia, in Latin America and the Caribbean, in South Asia, and in Sub-Saharan Africa. increased over the period in East Asia and Pacific, in the Middle East and North Africa, and in North America for these expenditure categories.

## PPPs beyond the benchmark year

- For the first time, extrapolated GDP PPPs beyond the most recent ICP benchmark year for 2022 and 2023 for 185 countries are published. The extrapolated PPPs are produced following the standard extrapolation approach [employed by the World Bank](#) World Development Indicators, that is, by applying available data on relative inflation to the ICP 2021 PPPs. Furthermore, available 2022 and 2023 PPPs for Eurostat and OECD countries are utilized.

\*\*\*

---

<sup>4</sup> What has to be considered when comparing PPP-derived data over time? Indices of real GDP provide a snapshot of the relative volume levels of GDP among participating countries for a given reference year. When placed side by side, the indices of consecutive reference years appear to provide a moving picture of relative GDP volume levels over these years. This apparent time series of volume measures is actually equivalent to a time series of value indices. This is because the volume indices for each reference year are calculated using the prices and expenditures of that year. Year-to-year changes in the volume indices are thus due to changes in relative price levels as well as changes in relative volume levels. As a result, the rates of relative growth derived from the indices are not consistent with those obtained from GDP volumes estimated by countries. (Eurostat-OECD Methodological Manual on Purchasing Power Parities, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2012) Furthermore, country groupings reflect participation in each ICP reference year, which may vary from one reference year to another.

### ***About the International Comparison Program***

The ICP is a multi-partner statistical initiative coordinated by the World Bank under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The ICP was initiated in 1968 and has been a permanent element of the global statistical programme since 2016, with the 2021 cycle the tenth comparison conducted. ICP implementation was coordinated by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank, in partnership with the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, the Statistical Office of the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Global coordination, methodology development, and governance activities were financed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a global public good, ICP data are used for research and analysis, indicator compilation, policy making, and administrative purposes at the national, bilateral, regional, and global levels. Users of ICP data, and the cross-country comparisons that they enable, include policy makers, multilateral institutions, academia, the media, and the private sector. The breadth and depth of the ICP dataset make it a valuable input to a wide range of themes under the economic, environmental, and social development umbrellas. PPPs are used to establish the international poverty line and measures of global poverty, which in turn are used by Sustainable Development Goal 1 to monitor progress. Other SDGs focusing on agriculture, health, education, labor, income inequality, and energy and emissions also draw on PPPs to track progress. ICP data are also used in the UN's Human Development Index and the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index. Analyses of economic growth, productivity, trade, government expenditure, investment, health costs, migration, waste, welfare, prices, and the impact of violence are other examples. The 2021 publication [\*Purchasing Power Parities for Policy Making: a Visual Guide to Using Data from the International Comparison Program\*](#) provides an in-depth look at these and other applications, and sets out the [recommended uses of the results and their limitations](#). For more information, visit the [International Comparison Program website](#).



## International Comparison Program 2021

# Regional highlights: East Asia and Pacific

### Regional participating economies

Eighteen economies: Australia; Brunei Darussalam; Cambodia; China; Fiji; Hong Kong SAR, China; Indonesia; Japan; Korea, Rep.; Lao PDR; Malaysia; Mongolia; New Zealand; Philippines; Singapore; Taiwan, China; Thailand; Vietnam.

### Size of economy

- Purchasing Power Parity (PPP)-based GDP: \$49,847 billion (32.7 percent of global GDP)
- Market exchange rate-based GDP: \$31,027 billion (32.3 percent of global GDP)
- Global population share: 30 percent
- The largest economy in the region was China, with a PPP-based GDP of \$28,822 billion or 58 percent of the regional total. China was also the largest economy in the world, contributing 19 percent of global GDP. Japan was the second largest in the region with \$5,567 billion, or 11 percent of the regional economy.
- The eight high-income economies in the region contributed 25 percent of regional GDP, the four upper-middle-income economies 63 percent, and the six lower-middle-income economies 12 percent.

### GDP and consumption per capita

- GDP per capita for the region averaged \$21,969, slightly higher than the global mean of \$20,271. There was wide variation within the region, from Cambodia with \$4,667 to Singapore with \$131,864. Using the index of GDP per capita that sets the global average at 100, this reflected a range of 23 to 651, with the regional average of 108 just above the world mean.
- Average material well-being, as measured by actual individual consumption (AIC) per capita, was \$11,463 for the region, slightly below the global mean of \$12,948. Cambodia recorded the lowest AIC per capita at \$3,284 and Hong Kong, SAR China had the highest in the region at \$44,577, and was the fourth highest in the world. Using the index of AIC per capita that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 25 in Cambodia to 344 in Hong Kong, SAR China, with a regional average of 89.

## Price Levels

- The Price Level Index (PLI) is the ratio of a PPP to a corresponding exchange rate. An index over 100 indicates that prices are higher than the world average, and a PLI below 100 indicates prices are relatively lower.
- The GDP PLI for the East Asia and Pacific region was 99, slightly below the global mean.
- Three economies (Mongolia, Vietnam, and Lao PDR) in the region had a GDP PLI of 50 or below, that is, less than half the global average, while two (Australia and New Zealand) had PLIs above 150, or more than 50 percent higher than the global average. The most expensive economy in East Asia and Pacific was Australia with a PLI of 169, while Mongolia was the cheapest at 48.
- Within individual consumption, clothing and footwear was the most expensive component in the region with a PLI of 134, while health was the least expensive with a PLI of 74.

## Individual consumption expenditures

- Expenditure on actual individual consumption (AIC) in the region was \$26,008 billion or 27 percent of the global total. China's AIC at \$13,115 billion was the largest national contribution in the region accounting for 50 percent, and the second largest in the world behind the United States. China contributed 13 percent of global AIC.
- With regards major components of AIC, East Asia and the Pacific accounted for around 24 percent of global expenditure on food and nonalcoholic beverages expenditure, 31 percent of global housing, water, electricity, gas, and other fuels expenditure, 29 percent of global health expenditure, and 28 percent of global education expenditure.
- China had the largest shares of global totals in the region, contributing 12 percent of global expenditure on food and nonalcoholic beverages expenditure, 18 percent of global housing expenditure, 14 percent of global health expenditure, and 14 percent of global education expenditure.

## Investment expenditures

- East Asia and Pacific accounted for nearly 44 percent the world's expenditure for investment (gross fixed capital formation). At 30 percent, China contributed the largest share in the world, and accounted for 68 percent of the regional total.
- On a per capita basis, Singapore spent the most on investment in the region at \$29,077 followed by Brunei Darussalam at \$22,741. Cambodia spent the least on a per capita basis at \$1,036. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 21 to 576.

## Government expenditures

- China had the largest share of global consumption expenditure by government at nearly 16 percent. East Asia and the Pacific had the second largest regional share at 31 percent, just behind Europe and Central Asia.

On a per capita basis, Brunei Darussalam had the largest government expenditure in the region at \$32,260 per person, and Cambodia the lowest at \$498. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 12 to 783.



\*\*\*

### ***About the International Comparison Program***

The ICP is a multi-partner statistical initiative coordinated by the World Bank under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The ICP was initiated in 1968 and been a permanent element of the global statistical programme since 2016, with the 2021 cycle the tenth comparison conducted. ICP implementation was coordinated by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank, in partnership with the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, the Statistical Office of the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Global coordination, methodology development, and governance activities were financed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a global public good, ICP data are used for research and analysis, indicator compilation, policy making, and administrative purposes at the national, bilateral, regional, and global levels. Users of ICP data, and the cross-country comparisons that they enable, include policy makers, multilateral institutions, academia, the media, and the private sector. The breadth and depth of the ICP dataset make it a valuable input to a wide range of themes under the economic, environmental, and social development umbrellas. PPPs are used to establish the international poverty line and measures of global poverty, which in turn are used by Sustainable Development Goal 1 to monitor progress. Other SDGs focusing on agriculture, health, education, labor, income inequality, and energy and emissions also draw on PPPs to track progress. ICP data are also used in the UN's Human Development Index and the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index. Analyses of economic growth, productivity, trade, government expenditure, investment, health costs, migration, waste, welfare, prices, and the impact of violence are other examples. The 2021 publication [Purchasing Power Parities for Policy Making: a Visual Guide to Using Data from the International Comparison Program](#) provides an in-depth look at these and other applications, and sets out the [recommended uses of the results and their limitations](#). For more information, visit the [International Comparison Program website](#).

PPPs are statistical estimates and should be treated as approximations of true values, subject to sampling, measurement, and classification errors. They should not be used as indicators of currency under- or overvaluation. ICP Results are based on data supplied by participating economies to the global and regional implementing agencies and produced in accordance with ICP methodology. Results are not deemed to be national official statistics.

The standard ICP methodology between the two most recent 2017 and 2021 ICP cycles has been maintained. However, in ICP 2021, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region was linked through the standard global core list approach, unlike in ICP 2017, when the CIS region was linked through the Russian Federation, which participated in both the OECD and CIS comparisons. For ICP 2017, the Russian Federation results are based on the OECD comparison, and for ICP 2021, they are based on the CIS comparison. Furthermore, the Asia and Pacific region moved to the standard ICP approach for estimating housing PPPs based on rental and volume data during the ICP 2021 cycle. The standard approach was utilized for the revised ICP 2017 results and ICP 2021 results, both at the regional and global levels, instead of the previously utilized reference volume approach.



## International Comparison Program 2021

# Regional highlights: Europe and Central Asia

### Regional participating economies

Forty-eight economies: Albania; Armenia; Austria; Azerbaijan; Belarus; Belgium; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Bulgaria; Croatia; Cyprus; Czechia; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; France; Georgia; Germany; Greece; Hungary; Iceland; Ireland; Italy; Kazakhstan; Kosovo, Kyrgyz Republic; Latvia; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Moldova; Montenegro; Netherlands; North Macedonia; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Romania; the Russian Federation; Serbia; Slovak Republic; Slovenia; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Tajikistan; Turkey; Ukraine; the United Kingdom, and Uzbekistan.

### Size of economy

- PPP-based GDP: \$39,023 billion (26 percent of global GDP)
- Market exchange rate-based GDP: \$25,207 billion (26 percent of global GDP)
- Global population share: 12 percent
- The largest economy in the region was the Russian Federation, with a PPP-based GDP of \$5,732 billion or 15 percent of the regional total. Germany was the second largest in the region with \$5,153 billion, or 13 percent of the regional economy.
- The 29 high-income economies in the region contributed 71 percent of regional GDP, the 14 upper-middle-income economies 26 percent, and the four lower-middle-income economies 3 percent.

### GDP and consumption per capita

- GDP per capita for the region averaged \$42,465 more than double the global mean of \$20,271. There was wide variation within the region, from Tajikistan with \$4,053 to Luxembourg with \$137,948, which was also the highest GDP per capita globally. Using the index of GDP per capita that sets the global average at 100, this reflected a range of 20 to 681, with a regional average of 209.
- Average material well-being, as measured by actual individual consumption (AIC) per capita, was \$27,227 for the region, over twice the global mean of \$12,948. Tajikistan recorded the lowest AIC per capita at \$3,421 and Luxembourg the highest in the region at \$47,419 and was the second highest in

the world, below the United States. Using the index of AIC per capita that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 26 in Tajikistan to 366 in Luxembourg, with an average of 210.

### Price Levels

- The Price Level Index (PLI) is the ratio of a PPP to a corresponding exchange rate. An index over 100 means prices are higher on average than in the world, and one less than 100 means prices are relatively lower.
- The GDP PLI for the region as a whole was 102.
- Ten economies (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Türkiye, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan) in the region had a GDP PLI of 50 or below, that is, less than half the global average, while six (Denmark, Iceland, Luxembourg, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland) had PLIs in excess of 150, or more than 50 percent higher than the global average. The most expensive economy in Europe and Central Asia was Switzerland with a PLI of 181, whilst Tajikistan was the cheapest at 36.
- Within individual consumption, housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels was the most expensive component in the region with a PLI of 125, while education was the least expensive with a PLI of 89.

### Individual consumption expenditures

- Expenditure on actual individual consumption (AIC) in the region was \$25,020 billion or 26 percent of the global total. The Russian Federation's AIC at \$3,359 billion was the largest national contribution accounting for 13 percent of the regional total.
- With regards to major components of AIC, Europe and Central Asia accounted for around 23 percent of global expenditure on food and nonalcoholic beverages expenditure, 24 percent of global housing, water, electricity, gas, and other fuels expenditure, 29 percent of global health expenditure, and 26 percent of global education expenditure.

### Investment expenditures

- Europe and Central Asia accounted for 22 percent the world's expenditure for investment (gross fixed capital formation). Germany had the largest regional share at 12 percent and was also the fifth largest globally.
- On a per capita basis, Ireland spent the most on investment in the region at \$31,436, followed by Luxembourg at \$30,877. Tajikistan spent the least on a per capita basis at \$1,058. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 21 to 623.

### Government expenditures

- Europe and Central Asia had the largest regional share of global consumption expenditure by government at 34 percent. The Russian Federation had the largest expenditure within the region at \$1,577 billion, or 15 percent of the regional total.
- On a per capita basis, Luxembourg had the largest government expenditure in the region at \$20,411 per person, and Tajikistan the lowest at \$1,327. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 32 to 495.

\*\*\*

### ***About the International Comparison Program***

The ICP is a multi-partner statistical initiative coordinated by the World Bank under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The ICP was initiated in 1968 and been a permanent element of the global statistical programme since 2016, with the 2021 cycle the tenth comparison conducted. ICP implementation was coordinated by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank, in partnership with the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, the Statistical Office of the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Global coordination, methodology development, and governance activities were financed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a global public good, ICP data are used for research and analysis, indicator compilation, policy making, and administrative purposes at the national, bilateral, regional, and global levels. Users of ICP data, and the cross-country comparisons that they enable, include policy makers, multilateral institutions, academia, the media, and the private sector. The breadth and depth of the ICP dataset make it a valuable input to a wide range of themes under the economic, environmental, and social development umbrellas. PPPs are used to establish the international poverty line and measures of global poverty, which in turn are used by Sustainable Development Goal 1 to monitor progress. Other SDGs focusing on agriculture, health, education, labor, income inequality, and energy and emissions also draw on PPPs to track progress. ICP data are also used in the UN's Human Development Index and the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index. Analyses of economic growth, productivity, trade, government expenditure, investment, health costs, migration, waste, welfare, prices, and the impact of violence are other examples. The 2021 publication [\*Purchasing Power Parities for Policy Making: a Visual Guide to Using Data from the International Comparison Program\*](#) provides an in-depth look at these and other applications, and sets out the [recommended uses of the results and their limitations](#). For more information, visit the [International Comparison Program website](#).

PPPs are statistical estimates and should be treated as approximations of true values, subject to sampling, measurement, and classification errors. They should not be used as indicators of currency under- or overvaluation. ICP Results are based on data supplied by participating economies to the global and regional implementing agencies and produced in accordance with ICP methodology. Results are not deemed to be national official statistics.

The standard ICP methodology between the two most recent 2017 and 2021 ICP cycles has been maintained. However, in ICP 2021, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region was linked through the standard global core list approach, unlike in ICP 2017, when the CIS region was linked through the Russian Federation, which participated in both the OECD and CIS comparisons. For ICP 2017, the Russian Federation results are based on the OECD comparison, and for ICP 2021, they are based on the CIS comparison. Furthermore, the Asia and Pacific region moved to the standard ICP approach for estimating housing PPPs based on rental and volume data during the ICP 2021 cycle. The standard approach was utilized for the revised ICP 2017 results and ICP 2021 results, both at the regional and global levels, instead of the previously utilized reference volume approach.



## International Comparison Program 2021

### Regional highlights:

## Latin America and the Caribbean

#### Regional participating economies

Thirty-five economies: Anguilla; Antigua and Barbuda; Argentina; Aruba; Belize; Bolivia; Bonaire, Brazil; British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands; Chile; Colombia; Costa Rica; Curaçao; Dominica; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; El Salvador; Grenada; Guatemala; Guyana; Honduras; Jamaica; Mexico; Montserrat; Nicaragua; Panama; Paraguay; Peru; Sint Maarten; St. Kitts and Nevis; St. Lucia; St. Vincent and the Grenadines; Suriname; Trinidad and Tobago; and Uruguay.

#### Size of the regional economy

- PPP-based GDP: \$11,126 billion (7 percent of global GDP)
- Market exchange rate-based GDP: \$4,990 billion (5 percent of global GDP)
- Global population share: 8 percent
- The largest economy in the region was Brazil, with a PPP-based GDP of \$3,710 billion or 33 percent of the regional total. Mexico was the second largest in the region with \$2,678 billion, or 24 percent of the regional economy.
- The eleven high-income economies in the region contributed 8 percent of regional GDP, the nineteen upper-middle-income economies 90 percent, and the four lower-middle-income economies 3 percent.

#### GDP and consumption per capita

- GDP per capita for the region averaged \$18,562, slightly below the global mean of \$20,271. There was wide variation within the region, from Honduras with \$6,286 to Cayman Islands with \$75,898. Using the index of GDP per capita that sets the global average at 100, this reflected a range of 31 to 374, with the regional average of 92. Excluding the Caribbean economies, Panama had the highest GDP per capita in Latin America with \$30,896 and a corresponding index of 152 relative to the world mean.

- Average material well-being, as measured by actual individual consumption (AIC) per capita, was \$13,843 for the region, slightly above the global mean of \$12,948. Nicaragua recorded the lowest AIC per capita at \$5,487 and Cayman Islands the highest in the region at \$37,818. Using the index of AIC per capita that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 42 to 292 with an average of 107. Excluding the Caribbean economies, Uruguay had the highest AIC per capita in Latin America of \$20,722, with a corresponding index of 159 relative to the world mean.

### Price Levels

- The Price Level Index (PLI) is the ratio of a PPP to a corresponding exchange rate. An index over 100 means prices are relatively higher on average than in the world, and one less than 100 means prices are relatively lower.
- The GDP PLI for the region was 71.
- The Cayman Islands was the only economy in the region to have a PLIs in excess of 150, or more than 50 percent higher than the global average while two economies (Suriname and Nicaragua) had a PLI below 50. The PLI for the Cayman Islands was 185, whilst Suriname was the cheapest at 42. Within Latin America, Uruguay registered the highest PLI at 102.
- Within individual consumption, food and non-alcoholic beverages was the most expensive component in the region with a PLI of 91, while education was the least expensive with a PLI of 40.

### Individual consumption expenditures

- Expenditures on actual individual consumption (AIC) in the region were \$8,298 billion or 9 percent of the global total. Brazil's AIC at \$2,697 billion was the largest national contribution in the region accounting for 33 percent, while Mexico's AIC expenditure was \$2,076 billion accounting 25 percent of the regional total. Together they for contributed 5 percent of the global total.
- With regards to the major components of AIC, Latin America and Caribbean accounted for around 10 percent of global expenditures on food and nonalcoholic beverages, 8 percent of global housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels expenditures, 7 percent of global health expenditures, and 13 percent of global education expenditures.

### Investment expenditures

- Latin America and Caribbean accounts for 5 percent the world's expenditures on investment (as defined by gross fixed capital formation). Brazil accounts for 35 percent of the regional total, while Mexico accounts for 21 percent.
- On a per capita basis, the Cayman Islands spends the most on investment in the region at \$12,798, followed by St. Kitts and Nevis at \$10,748. Within Latin America, Panama has the highest per capita investment at \$8,113 and Nicaragua spends the least in the region as a whole on a per capita basis at \$1,279. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranges from 25 to 253.

### Government expenditures

- Brazil had the largest regional share of expenditures by government at 30 percent, while Mexico had the second largest at nearly 24 percent. Latin America and Caribbean had the fourth largest regional share of global expenditure at nearly 9 percent.

- On a per capita basis, Montserrat had the largest government expenditures in the region at \$25,064 per person, and Guatemala the lowest at \$1,358. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 33 to 608. Excluding the Caribbean economies, Argentina had the highest per capita government spending in Latin America with \$8,375 with a corresponding index of 38 relative to the world mean.

\*\*\*

### ***About the International Comparison Program***

The ICP is a multi-partner statistical initiative coordinated by the World Bank under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The ICP was initiated in 1968 and been a permanent element of the global statistical programme since 2016, with the 2021 cycle the tenth comparison conducted. ICP implementation was coordinated by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank, in partnership with the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, the Statistical Office of the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Global coordination, methodology development, and governance activities were financed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a global public good, ICP data are used for research and analysis, indicator compilation, policy making, and administrative purposes at the national, bilateral, regional, and global levels. Users of ICP data, and the cross-country comparisons that they enable, include policy makers, multilateral institutions, academia, the media, and the private sector. The breadth and depth of the ICP dataset make it a valuable input to a wide range of themes under the economic, environmental, and social development umbrellas. PPPs are used to establish the international poverty line and measures of global poverty, which in turn are used by Sustainable Development Goal 1 to monitor progress. Other SDGs focusing on agriculture, health, education, labor, income inequality, and energy and emissions also draw on PPPs to track progress. ICP data are also used in the UN's Human Development Index and the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index. Analyses of economic growth, productivity, trade, government expenditure, investment, health costs, migration, waste, welfare, prices, and the impact of violence are other examples. The 2021 publication [\*Purchasing Power Parities for Policy Making: a Visual Guide to Using Data from the International Comparison Program\*](#) provides an in-depth look at these and other applications, and sets out the [recommended uses of the results and their limitations](#). For more information, visit the [International Comparison Program website](#).

PPPs are statistical estimates and should be treated as approximations of true values, subject to sampling, measurement, and classification errors. They should not be used as indicators of currency under- or overvaluation. ICP Results are based on data supplied by participating economies to the global and regional implementing agencies and produced in accordance with ICP methodology. Results are not deemed to be national official statistics.

The standard ICP methodology between the two most recent 2017 and 2021 ICP cycles has been maintained. However, in ICP 2021, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region was linked through the standard global core list approach, unlike in ICP 2017, when the CIS region was linked through the Russian Federation, which participated in both the OECD and CIS comparisons. For ICP 2017, the Russian Federation results are based on the OECD comparison, and for ICP 2021, they are

based on the CIS comparison. Furthermore, the Asia and Pacific region moved to the standard ICP approach for estimating housing PPPs based on rental and volume data during the ICP 2021 cycle. The standard approach was utilized for the revised ICP 2017 results and ICP 2021 results, both at the regional and global levels, instead of the previously utilized reference volume approach.





## International Comparison Program 2021

# Regional highlights: Middle East and North Africa

### Regional participating economies

Eighteen economies: Algeria; Bahrain; Djibouti; Egypt, Arab Rep.; Iraq; Israel; Jordan; Kuwait; Lebanon; Malta; Morocco; Oman; Qatar; Saudi Arabia; Syrian Arab Republic; Tunisia; United Arab Emirates; West Bank and Gaza

### Size of the regional economy

- PPP-based GDP: \$7,250 billion (5 percent of global GDP)
- Market exchange rate-based GDP: \$3,347 billion (3 percent of global GDP)
- Global population share: 5 percent
- The largest economy in the region was Egypt, Arab Rep., with a PPP-based GDP of \$1,875 billion or 26 percent of the regional total. Saudi Arabia was the second largest in the region with \$1,717 billion or 24 percent of regional GDP, and United Arab Emirates was the third largest with \$645 billion or 9 percent of regional GDP.
- The eight high-income economies in the region contributed 49 percent of regional GDP, the two upper-middle-income economies 8 percent, the seven lower-middle-income economies 41 percent, and the Syrian Arab Republic as the one low-income country contributed 1 percent to regional GDP.

### GDP and consumption per capita

- GDP per capita for the region averaged \$20,186, above the global mean of \$20,271. There was wide variation within the region, from the Syrian Arab Republic with \$2,310 to Qatar with \$106,491, with the latter economy the fourth highest in the world in per capita terms. Using the index of GDP per capita that sets the global average at 100, this reflected a range of 11 to 525, with the regional average of 100.
- Average material well-being, as measured by actual individual consumption (AIC) per capita, was \$13,189 for the region, above the global mean of \$12,948. The Syrian Arab Republic recorded the

lowest AIC per capita at \$2,834 and United Arab Emirates the highest in the region at \$32,056. Using the index of AIC per capita that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 22 in the Syrian Arab Republic to 248 in United Arab Emirates, with an average of 102.

### Price Levels

- The Price Level Index (PLI) is the ratio of a PPP to a corresponding exchange rate. An index over 100 means prices are relatively higher on average than in the world, and one less than 100 means prices are relatively lower.
- The GDP PLI for the region was 73.
- Four economies (Syrian Arab Republic, Egypt, Algeria, and Tunisia) in the region had a GDP PLI of 50 or below, that is, less than half the global average, while one (Israel) had PLI in excess of 150, or more than 50 percent higher than the global average. The most expensive economy in Middle East and North Africa was Israel with a PLI of 179, whilst the Syrian Arab Republic was the cheapest at 31.
- Within individual consumption, communication was the most expensive component in the region with a PLI of 94, whilst housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels was the least expensive with a PLI of 51.

### Individual consumption expenditures

- Expenditures on actual individual consumption (AIC) in the region were \$4,737 billion or 5 percent of the global total. Egypt's AIC at \$1,724 billion was the largest national contribution in the region accounting for 36 percent.
- With regards to the major components of AIC, Middle East and North Africa accounted for around 6 percent of global expenditures on food and nonalcoholic beverages, 7 percent of global housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels expenditures, 4 percent of global health expenditures, and 5 percent of global education expenditures.

### Investment expenditures

- Middle East and North Africa accounted for 4 percent the world's expenditures on investment (as defined by gross fixed capital formation). Saudi Arabia's expenditures on investment is the largest, accounting for 33 percent of the regional total.
- On a per capita basis, Qatar spent the most on investment in the region at \$44,533, followed by UAE at \$16,939. The Syrian Arab Republic spent the least on a per capita basis at \$89. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 2 to 882.

### Government expenditures

- Middle East and North Africa accounted for nearly 6 percent of global government expenditure. Saudi Arabia spent the most on government expenditure, accounted for 30 percent of the regional total.
- On a per capita basis, Qatar had the largest government expenditures in the region at \$26,833 per person, and the Syrian Arab Republic the lowest at \$686. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 17 to 651.

\*\*\*

### ***About the International Comparison Program***

The ICP is a multi-partner statistical initiative coordinated by the World Bank under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The ICP was initiated in 1968 and been a permanent element of the global statistical programme since 2016, with the 2021 cycle the tenth comparison conducted. ICP implementation was coordinated by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank, in partnership with the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, the Statistical Office of the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Global coordination, methodology development, and governance activities were financed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a global public good, ICP data are used for research and analysis, indicator compilation, policy making, and administrative purposes at the national, bilateral, regional, and global levels. Users of ICP data, and the cross-country comparisons that they enable, include policy makers, multilateral institutions, academia, the media, and the private sector. The breadth and depth of the ICP dataset make it a valuable input to a wide range of themes under the economic, environmental, and social development umbrellas. PPPs are used to establish the international poverty line and measures of global poverty, which in turn are used by Sustainable Development Goal 1 to monitor progress. Other SDGs focusing on agriculture, health, education, labor, income inequality, and energy and emissions also draw on PPPs to track progress. ICP data are also used in the UN's Human Development Index and the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index. Analyses of economic growth, productivity, trade, government expenditure, investment, health costs, migration, waste, welfare, prices, and the impact of violence are other examples. The 2021 publication [Purchasing Power Parities for Policy Making: a Visual Guide to Using Data from the International Comparison Program](#) provides an in-depth look at these and other applications, and sets out the [recommended uses of the results and their limitations](#). For more information, visit the [International Comparison Program website](#).

PPPs are statistical estimates and should be treated as approximations of true values, subject to sampling, measurement, and classification errors. They should not be used as indicators of currency under- or overvaluation. ICP Results are based on data supplied by participating economies to the global and regional implementing agencies and produced in accordance with ICP methodology. Results are not deemed to be national official statistics.

The standard ICP methodology between the two most recent 2017 and 2021 ICP cycles has been maintained. However, in ICP 2021, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region was linked through the standard global core list approach, unlike in ICP 2017, when the CIS region was linked through the Russian Federation, which participated in both the OECD and CIS comparisons. For ICP 2017, the Russian Federation results are based on the OECD comparison, and for ICP 2021, they are based on the CIS comparison. Furthermore, the Asia and Pacific region moved to the standard ICP approach for estimating housing PPPs based on rental and volume data during the ICP 2021 cycle. The standard approach was utilized for the revised ICP 2017 results and ICP 2021 results, both at the regional and global levels, instead of the previously utilized reference volume approach.



## International Comparison Program 2021

# Regional highlights: South Asia

### Regional participating economies

Seven economies: Bangladesh; Bhutan; India; Maldives; Nepal; Pakistan; Sri Lanka.

### Size of the regional economy

- PPP-based GDP: \$14,175 billion (9.3 percent of global GDP)
- Market exchange rate-based GDP: \$4,027 billion (4.2 percent of global GDP)
- Global population share: 24.1 percent
- The largest economy in the region was India, with a PPP-based GDP of \$10,963 billion or 77 percent of the regional total. Pakistan was the second largest in the region with \$1,410 billion, or 10 percent of the regional economy.
- Maldives, the only one upper-middle-income economy in the region contributed less than 0.1 percent of regional GDP, while the six lower-middle-income economies accounted for over 99 percent.

### GDP and consumption per capita

- GDP per capita for the region averaged \$7,811, which was below the global mean of \$20,271. There was wide variation within the region, from Maldives with \$17,309 to Nepal with \$4,813. Using the index of GDP per capita that sets the global average at 100, this reflected a range of 24 to 85, with the regional average at 39.
- Average material well-being, as measured by actual individual consumption (AIC) per capita, was \$5,809 for the region, below the global mean of \$12,948. Nepal recorded the lowest AIC per capita at \$4,338 and Sri Lanka the highest in the region at \$10,146. Using the index of AIC per capita that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 34 in Nepal to 78 in Sri Lanka, with an average of 45.

## Price Levels

- The Price Level Index (PLI) is the ratio of a PPP to a corresponding exchange rate. An index over 100 indicates prices are higher than the world average, and a PLI less than 100 indicates prices are relatively lower.
- The GDP PLI for the region was 45, around half the global average.
- Five economies (Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka) in the region had a GDP PLI of 50 or below, that is, less than half the global average. The most expensive economy in South Asia was Maldives with a PLI of 85, whilst Bhutan was the cheapest at 42.
- Within individual consumption, alcoholic beverages, tobacco and narcotics was the most expensive component compared with the world average in the region with a PLI of 92, while health was the least expensive with a PLI of 24.

## Individual consumption expenditures

- Expenditures on actual individual consumption (AIC) in the region were \$10,542 billion or 11 percent of the global total. India's AIC at \$7,855 billion was the largest national contribution in the region accounting for 75 percent of the regional total, and the third largest in the world behind the United States and China. Overall, India contributed 8 percent of the global total.

## Investment expenditures

- South Asia accounts for 8 percent the world's expenditures on investment (as defined by gross fixed capital formation). At 7 percent, India contributes the third largest share in the world, and accounts for 82 percent of the regional total.
- On a per capita basis, Maldives spent the most on investment in the region at \$5,056, followed by Bhutan at \$3,917. Pakistan spent the least on a per capita basis at \$611. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 12 to 100.

## Government expenditures

- South Asia accounts for 5 percent the world's government expenditures and India accounts for 76 percent of the regional total.
- On a per capita basis, Bhutan had the largest government expenditures in the region at \$6,767 per person, and Nepal the lowest at \$514. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 12 to 164.

\*\*\*

## ***About the International Comparison Program***

The ICP is a multi-partner statistical initiative coordinated by the World Bank under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The ICP was initiated in 1968 and been a permanent element of

the global statistical programme since 2016, with the 2021 cycle the tenth comparison conducted. ICP implementation was coordinated by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank, in partnership with the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, the Statistical Office of the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Global coordination, methodology development, and governance activities were financed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a global public good, ICP data are used for research and analysis, indicator compilation, policy making, and administrative purposes at the national, bilateral, regional, and global levels. Users of ICP data, and the cross-country comparisons that they enable, include policy makers, multilateral institutions, academia, the media, and the private sector. The breadth and depth of the ICP dataset make it a valuable input to a wide range of themes under the economic, environmental, and social development umbrellas. PPPs are used to establish the international poverty line and measures of global poverty, which in turn are used by Sustainable Development Goal 1 to monitor progress. Other SDGs focusing on agriculture, health, education, labor, income inequality, and energy and emissions also draw on PPPs to track progress. ICP data are also used in the UN's Human Development Index and the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index. Analyses of economic growth, productivity, trade, government expenditure, investment, health costs, migration, waste, welfare, prices, and the impact of violence are other examples. The 2021 publication [Purchasing Power Parities for Policy Making: a Visual Guide to Using Data from the International Comparison Program](#) provides an in-depth look at these and other applications, and sets out the [recommended uses of the results and their limitations](#). For more information, visit the [International Comparison Program website](#).

PPPs are statistical estimates and should be treated as approximations of true values, subject to sampling, measurement, and classification errors. They should not be used as indicators of currency under- or overvaluation. ICP Results are based on data supplied by participating economies to the global and regional implementing agencies and produced in accordance with ICP methodology. Results are not deemed to be national official statistics.

The standard ICP methodology between the two most recent 2017 and 2021 ICP cycles has been maintained. However, in ICP 2021, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region was linked through the standard global core list approach, unlike in ICP 2017, when the CIS region was linked through the Russian Federation, which participated in both the OECD and CIS comparisons. For ICP 2017, the Russian Federation results are based on the OECD comparison, and for ICP 2021, they are based on the CIS comparison. Furthermore, the Asia and Pacific region moved to the standard ICP approach for estimating housing PPPs based on rental and volume data during the ICP 2021 cycle. The standard approach was utilized for the revised ICP 2017 results and ICP 2021 results, both at the regional and global levels, instead of the previously utilized reference volume approach.



## International Comparison Program 2021

# Regional highlights: Sub-Saharan Africa

### Regional participating economies

Forty-seven economies: Angola; Benin; Botswana; Burkina Faso; Burundi; Cameroon; Cabo Verde; Central African Republic; Chad; Comoros; Congo, Dem. Rep.; Congo, Rep.; Côte d'Ivoire; Equatorial Guinea; Eswatini; Ethiopia; Gabon; Gambia, The; Ghana; Guinea; Guinea-Bissau; Kenya; Lesotho; Liberia; Madagascar; Malawi; Mali; Mauritania; Mauritius; Mozambique; Namibia; Niger; Nigeria; Rwanda; São Tomé and Príncipe; Senegal; Seychelles; Sierra Leone; Somalia, South Africa; South Sudan, Sudan; Tanzania; Togo; Uganda; Zambia; Zimbabwe.

### Size of the regional economy

- PPP-based GDP: \$5,258 billion (3.5 percent of global GDP)
- Market exchange rate-based GDP: \$1,981 billion (2.1 percent of global GDP)
- Global population share: 15.8 percent
- The largest economy in the region was Nigeria, with a PPP-based GDP of \$1,200 billion or 23 percent of the regional total. South Africa was the second largest in the region with \$845 billion, or 16 percent of the regional economy.
- The one high-income economy (Seychelles) in the region contributed less than 0.1 percent of regional GDP, the six upper-middle-income economies 19 percent, the 17 lower-middle-income economies 52 percent, and the 23 low-income economies 28 percent.

### GDP and consumption per capita

- GDP per capita for the region averaged \$4,430, below the global mean of \$20,271. There was wide variation within the region, from Burundi with \$981 to Seychelles with \$29,712. Using the index of GDP per capita that sets the global average at 100, this reflected a range of 5 to 147, and the regional average of 22 was below the world mean.
- Average material well-being, as measured by actual individual consumption (AIC) per capita, was \$3,228 for the region, well below the global mean of \$12,948. Congo, Dem. Rep. recorded the lowest

AIC per capita at \$689 and Seychelles the highest in the region at \$19,231. Using the index of AIC per capita that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 5 in to 149, with an average of 25.

### Price Levels

- The Price Level Index (PLI) is the ratio of a PPP to a corresponding exchange rate. An index over 100 means prices are relatively higher on average than in the world, and one less than 100 means prices are relatively lower.
- The GDP PLI for the region was 60.
- Seven economies (Angola, Burundi, Ethiopia, The Gambia, Madagascar, Rwanda, and Sudan) in the region had a GDP PLI of 50 or below, that is, less than half the global average. The most expensive economy in Sub-Saharan Africa was Zimbabwe with a PLI of 86, whilst Sudan was the cheapest at 37.
- Within individual consumption, food and non-alcoholic beverages were the most expensive component in the region with a PLI of 90, while health was the least expensive with a PLI of 43.

### Individual consumption expenditures

- Expenditures on actual individual consumption (AIC) in the region were \$3,831 billion or 4 percent of the global total. Nigeria's AIC at \$796 billion was the largest national contribution in the region accounting for 21 percent, contributing less than 1 percent of the global total.
- With regards to the major components of AIC, Sub-Saharan Africa accounted for around 7 percent of global expenditures on food and nonalcoholic beverages, 4 percent of global housing, water, electricity, gas, and other fuels expenditures, 2 percent of global health expenditures, and 4 percent of global education expenditures.

### Investment expenditures

- Sub-Saharan Africa accounted for just over 2 percent of the world's expenditures on investment (as defined by gross fixed capital formation). Nigeria accounts for 30 percent of the regional total, the largest share of all economies in the region.
- On a per capita basis, Seychelles spent the most on investment in the region at \$7,730, followed by Mauritius at \$4,499. Burundi spent the least on a per capita basis at \$90. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 2 to 153.

### Government expenditures

- Sub-Saharan Africa's regional share stood at 3 percent of global government expenditures. South Africa accounted for 19 percent of the regional total, the largest share of all economies in the region.
- On a per capita basis, Seychelles had the largest government expenditures in the region at \$14,674 per person, and Sudan the lowest at \$81. Using the index of per capita expenditures that sets the global average at 100, the region ranged from 2 to 356.

\*\*\*



### ***About the International Comparison Program***

The ICP is a multi-partner statistical initiative coordinated by the World Bank under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission. The ICP was initiated in 1968 and been a permanent element of the global statistical programme since 2016, with the 2021 cycle the tenth comparison conducted. ICP implementation was coordinated by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank, in partnership with the African Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, the Statistical Office of the European Union and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Global coordination, methodology development, and governance activities were financed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a global public good, ICP data are used for research and analysis, indicator compilation, policy making, and administrative purposes at the national, bilateral, regional, and global levels. Users of ICP data, and the cross-country comparisons that they enable, include policy makers, multilateral institutions, academia, the media, and the private sector. The breadth and depth of the ICP dataset make it a valuable input to a wide range of themes under the economic, environmental, and social development umbrellas. PPPs are used to establish the international poverty line and measures of global poverty, which in turn are used by Sustainable Development Goal 1 to monitor progress. Other SDGs focusing on agriculture, health, education, labor, income inequality, and energy and emissions also draw on PPPs to track progress. ICP data are also used in the UN's Human Development Index and the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index. Analyses of economic growth, productivity, trade, government expenditure, investment, health costs, migration, waste, welfare, prices, and the impact of violence are other examples. The 2021 publication [Purchasing Power Parities for Policy Making: a Visual Guide to Using Data from the International Comparison Program](#) provides an in-depth look at these and other applications, and sets out the [recommended uses of the results and their limitations](#). For more information, visit the [International Comparison Program website](#).

PPPs are statistical estimates and should be treated as approximations of true values, subject to sampling, measurement, and classification errors. They should not be used as indicators of currency under- or overvaluation. ICP Results are based on data supplied by participating economies to the global and regional implementing agencies and produced in accordance with ICP methodology. Results are not deemed to be national official statistics.

The standard ICP methodology between the two most recent 2017 and 2021 ICP cycles has been maintained. However, in ICP 2021, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) region was linked through the standard global core list approach, unlike in ICP 2017, when the CIS region was linked through the Russian Federation, which participated in both the OECD and CIS comparisons. For ICP 2017, the Russian Federation results are based on the OECD comparison, and for ICP 2021, they are based on the CIS comparison. Furthermore, the Asia and Pacific region moved to the standard ICP approach for estimating housing PPPs based on rental and volume data during the ICP 2021 cycle. The standard approach was utilized for the revised ICP 2017 results and ICP 2021 results, both at the regional and global levels, instead of the previously utilized reference volume approach.