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## Foreword

The International Comparison Program (ICP), under the auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC), is the largest global statistical initiative aimed at estimating purchasing power parities (PPPs) to compare the real size and price levels of economies around the world. In the 2017 cycle, 176 economies participated from Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Commonwealth of Independent States, Latin America and the Caribbean, Western Asia, and the regular PPP program managed by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Statistical Office of the European Communities (Eurostat), with the World Bank coordinating the global program. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) continues as the regional implementing agency (RIA) for the ICP in Asia and the Pacific. The 2017 ICP cycle marks ADB's successful completion of the third benchmark under its stewardship, after the 2005 and 2011 benchmarks.

During its 47th session in March 2016, the UNSC considered the evaluation report of the 2011 ICP by the Friends of the Chair group and accepted its recommendation to establish the ICP as a permanent element of the global statistical work program, to be conducted more frequently, which led to the decision to implement the ICP every three years, beginning with 2017. It also recommended keeping the general methodology from 2011 stable for the 2017 cycle, except for fine-tuning some methods.

Asia and the Pacific is a unique, diverse region that includes the world's most populous economies and very small island states; the richest economies in per capita gross domestic product (GDP) and economies near the bottom of the ladder; and economies with widely divergent capacity in their statistical systems. The 22 participating economies in the 2017 ICP in the region are Bangladesh; Bhutan; Brunei Darussalam; Cambodia; Fiji; Hong Kong, China; India; Indonesia; the Lao People's Democratic Republic; Malaysia; Maldives; Mongolia; Myanmar; Nepal; Pakistan; the People's Republic of China; the Philippines; Singapore; Sri Lanka; Taipei,China; Thailand; and Viet Nam.

This publication presents the estimates of 2017 regional PPPs and summary results of real GDP and its major components for the 22 participating economies. A final report with a detailed description of ICP methods, results for 2017 , and revised 2011 results will be released around middle of 2020 . In line with the global consensus to keep the general methodology from the 2011 ICP, ADB only adopted certain refinements introduced at the global level to improve the robustness of the methods. ADB also applied these refinements to the 2011 revisions to ensure consistency and comparability between the 2011 revised PPPs and the 2017 benchmark PPPs.

ADB's ICP team rigorously validated the data submitted by the economies, using enhanced data validation tools in close collaboration with the implementing agencies from participating economies to ensure high quality of the data used to calculate the PPPs and other results. As part of ongoing research to improve the methodology for comparing dwelling services, ADB developed a new methodology, which the ICP Technical Advisory Group recommended for introduction in the 2020 ICP. While using standard PPP computation tools formulated by the World Bank for calculating the results, ADB also developed a program in Stata software to replicate and validate these results.

With more than half the world's population living in the 22 participating economies, the PPPs and results from the region are critical inputs to the global PPPs estimated by the World Bank. These PPPs enable real comparisons of GDP and its components across economies in terms of volumes of final goods and services by accounting for price level differences. Increasingly, the PPPs produced from the ICP are appearing in other applications. One major use of PPPs is the estimation of poverty incidence to monitor Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 1 to eliminate poverty from the world. In addition, other PPP-based indicators in the SDG framework help monitor income inequality, energy intensity, labor productivity, and carbon dioxide emissions per unit of GDP.

I trust that the regional results will also be useful for researchers for comparative analysis and policy making. I am also pleased to see that the ICP continues to be a platform for statistical capacity building in price statistics and national accounts, which is evident as economies increasingly apply good practices from ICP to price statistics and national accounts statistics. As in 2005 and 2011, the guiding principles in implementing the 2017 ICP have been transparency, ownership, and a bottom-up approach, which have proven fundamental to the success of the ICP in Asia and the Pacific.

I wish to expresses my sincere appreciation to all who have made this project a success: the ICP Regional Advisory Board for Asia and the Pacific for its overall guidance; the ICP's group of experts for their technical and methodological advice; the World Bank ICP Global Office for its continued technical guidance to the regional program; the dedicated ICP team of the Statistics and Data Innovation Unit, ADB; and most of all, the implementing agencies in the participating economies for their hard work and cooperation, without whom the program cannot be successful.


Yasuyuki Sawada
Chief Economist and Director General
Economic Research and Regional Cooperation Department
Asian Development Bank
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| GEKS | Gini-Èltetö-Köves-Szulc |
| GFCE | government final consumption expenditure |
| GFCF | gross fixed capital formation |
| ICEG | individual consumption expenditure by government |
| ICEH | individual consumption expenditure by households |
| ICP | International Comparison Program |
| NPISH | nonprofit institutions serving households |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| PLI | price level index |
| PPP | purchasing power parity |
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## What Is the International Comparison Program?

The International Comparison Program (ICP) is the world's largest global statistical initiative. It aims to produce globally comparable measures of gross domestic product (GDP) and its components-such as household consumption expenditure, government consumption expenditure, gross fixed capital formation, and net exports-based on purchasing power parities (PPPs) for economies across the world. In different economies, statistical offices publish macroeconomic aggregates of national accounts statistics in their local currency units and, therefore, these aggregates are strictly not comparable across economies. Exchange rates are readily available for converting these aggregates into a common currency unit such as the United States (US) dollar. However, exchange rates have severe limitations when used to compare real income or expenditures across economies. Exchange rates-determined by the demand for and the supply of respective local currencies-do not reflect relative price level differentials across economies. Exchange rates are also volatile, reflecting a range of factors that affect currency markets. Using exchange rates to compare GDP and household consumption is meaningful only when the absolute purchasing power parity theory, which predicts that price levels will be the same across countries, holds. However, in the presence of a large proportion of non-tradeable goods and services in GDP, high and differential transport costs, and imperfect international markets with different tax and tariff regimes, the purchasing power parity theory does not hold, so exchange rates are not meaningful in comparing real incomes across economies.

## A Brief History of the International Comparison Program

The need for a meaningful alternative to exchange rates led Irving Kravis, Alan Heston, Robert Summers, and Zoltan Kenessey to establish the ICP at the University of Pennsylvania. The seminal studies of Milton Gilbert and Kravis (1954) and Gilbert and Associates (1958) demonstrated that a considerable gap can exist between exchange rates and the PPPs that adequately reflect relative price differences across economies. Their research and findings finally led to the establishment of the ICP.

The ICP aims to provide statistically and economically sound measures of price level differences, in the form of PPPs of currencies, and to compile and disseminate internationally comparable measures of real GDP and its components. Kravis et al. (1975 and 1978) were instrumental in establishing the procedures and guidelines for undertaking international comparisons.

In 2018, the ICP reached a milestone that marked 50 years since beginning work on international comparisons of national accounts aggregates. The ICP started in 1968 as a small-scale research project at the University of Pennsylvania, led by professors Kravis, Heston, and Summers. Since then, jointly undertaken with the United Nations Statistics Division, the project has grown steadily over 5 decades, finally achieving the status of a global statistical initiative. The ICP is currently conducted under the charter and auspices of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC), whichoversees its implementation to ensure timeliness, quality, and reliability of international comparisons of GDP and its main aggregates.

In 1970, the first phase of the ICP covered only 10 economies, steadily increasing to 16 in 1973 and 34 in 1975, 60 in 1980, and 64 in 1985, and 115 economies in 1993. The ICP covered 146 economies in the 2005 cycle, when the ICP adopted a new global governance, with national statistical offices responsible for price and national accounts data, regional agencies coordinating regional activities, and the World Bank coordinating the global program. The 2011 ICP round was the largest ever conducted. It included 177 economies participating at the full economy level, covering all components of GDP, and an additional 22 economies covering only the household consumption aggregate. With 176 participating economies, the current 2017 ICP cycle covers more than $99 \%$ of the world population and the world's economic activity and is thus justifiably recognized as a global statistical program.

## Evaluation of 2011 International Comparison Program

In 2014, at its 45 th session, the UNSC established the Friends of the Chair group to evaluate the 2011 ICP

## THE PRINCIPAL OBJECTIVE <br> OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON PROGRAM

The principal objective of the International Comparison Program (ICP) is to provide statistically and economically sound measures of price level differences, in the form of purchasing power parities (PPPs) of currencies, and to compile and disseminate internationally comparable measures of real gross domestic product (GDP) and its components.
cycle. The group presented its preliminary report in 2015 at the 46th Session of the UNSC and its final report at its 47 th Session in 2016. The UNSC endorsed the group's finding and made three important recommendations that have largely guided the 2017 ICP cycle: (i) instituting the ICP as a permanent element of the global statistical work program, to be conducted at more frequent intervals; (ii) keeping the general methodology from 2011 stable for the 2017 comparison cycle; and (iii) implementing a short-term research agenda limited to fine-tuning methods in areas such as implementing a rolling benchmark approach and building a PPP time series, integrating ICP and consumer price index (CPI) survey activities, streamlining the use of productivity adjustments for government services, global linking procedures, and quality assurance of the resulting 2017 PPPs. Implementing the first recommendation, the World Bank, which has been acting as the Global Office for the ICP, has now established the ICP in the work program of the Development Data Group. The second recommendation, to keep the general methodology stable during the 2017 ICP cycle, has been strictly adhered to by the ICP Global Office at the World Bank as well as the regional implementing agencies, except for minor refinements. Finally, for the third recommendation, task forces established under the ICP undertook research in fine-tuning methods and procedures.

## Structure of the Report

This summary report gives an overview of the main results from the 2017 ICP cycle in Asia and the Pacific for readers who are familiar with the ICP and for uninitiated readers who are interested in information on relative sizes of the participating economies.

Chapter 2 introduces the ICP's global governance, history, structure, and implementation in Asia and the Pacific. Chapter 3 explains the key concepts of PPPs, price levels, and the notion of nominal and real expenditures, in order to help the readers who may
not be familiar with these terms better understand ICP results. Chapter 4 presents the main results from the 2017 ICP in Asia and the Pacific: PPPs, price levels, real expenditures, rankings of economies by GDP; individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) and nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH); actual individual consumption by households (AICH); government final consumption expenditure (GFCE); and gross fixed capital formation (GFCF). The definitions of these terms and concepts are provided in the Glossary at the end of this report. Chapter 5 is devoted to a comparative analysis and appraisal of the consistency between results from the 2017 ICP cycle and extrapolations from the revised results of 2011 ICP in Asia and the Pacific. Chapter 6
summarizes key results and conclusions with notes on the lessons learned from implementing the 2017 ICP cycle and thoughts on future ICP activities in Asia and the Pacific. The report includes additional details on ICP methodology (Appendix 1); the membership of the Regional Advisory Board (Appendix 2); implementing agencies in the participating economies (Appendix 3); detailed statistical tables for the 2017 ICP results (Appendix 4); detailed statistical tables for the revised 2011 ICP results (Appendix 5); the structure of GDP and changes in the ICP classification (Appendix 6); reference basic headings in calculating other basic headings (Appendix 7); and the scope and coverage of main GDP aggregates in 2011 and 2017 (Appendix 8).

## 2. <br> The International Comparison Program in Asia and the Pacific, 2017

## Global Governance

Following the recommendations of the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC), the World Bank established the following governance structure to implement the 2017 cycle of the International Comparison Program (ICP) (World Bank 2016a).

- ICP Governing Board. This strategic body sets policies that govern the compilation of purchasing power parities (PPPs), approves methodological improvements, and conducts outreach and fundraising.
- ICP Global Office at the World Bank. The ICP Global Office acts as the global implementing agency which (i) coordinates and implements the global aspects of the ICP, and (ii) calculates and disseminates the global ICP results.
- Inter-Agency Coordination Group. Chaired by the World Bank, this group includes regional implementing agencies (RIAs) and the International Monetary Fund, who jointly determine activities for data collection, validation, calculation and dissemination work plans, and capacity building.
- Technical Advisory Group and task force(s). This pool of experts in the fields of index numbers, PPPs, price statistics, and national accounts ensures methodological soundness and overall quality in the PPP estimates and is responsible for setting and steering the ICP research agenda.
- Regional implementing agencies. These agencies coordinate regional comparisons and calculate regional ICP results. These include the Asian Development Bank (ADB) for Asia and the Pacific, the African Development Bank (for Africa), the Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (for
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the Commonwealth of Independent States), the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (for Latin America and the Caribbean), and United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (for Western Asia). Reflecting existing arrangements, Statistical Office of the European Union (Eurostat) for European countries and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) for non-European OECD countries are responsible for Eurostat-OECD PPP Program.


## The 2017 Cycle in Asia and the Pacific

The ICP's nature and operation has changed significantly over time. From its inception in 1968 until 1985, the ICP's price and real gross domestic product (GDP) expenditure comparisons were global in their item selection, the survey framework for collecting prices, and the subsequent methodology for aggregating price and national accounts data. Since the 1980 cycle, the ICP has gradually moved toward a regional approach that undertakes price comparisons first at the regional level, considering differences in types of goods and services available in different regions, and subsequently derives global comparisons using specially designed linking procedures.

Rigorous implementation of a regionalized ICP, outside the European Union and the OECD group of economies, began in earnest from the 2005 ICP cycle. The ICP set appropriate governing structures and methods for regional comparisons and subsequent linking and global comparisons (Rao 2013). RIAs
assumed responsibilities for their regions while the ICP Global Office at the World Bank coordinated activities across regions and compiled and published results at the global level. The national statistical offices undertook the roles of implementing agencies for carrying out ICP price surveys for their economies and submission of required data to their RIA. ADB took the lead and responsibility as the RIA for implementing the ICP in 2005 in Asia and the Pacific and continued its stewardship for the 2011 and 2017 ICP cycles in the region.

In implementing the ICP in Asia and the Pacific, ADB established the principles of ownership, transparency, and a commitment to the quality and integrity of the data that underpins the compilation of PPPs and real expenditures. ADB has striven to foster mutual cooperation and strong commitment among the participating economies. Throughout the implementation of the 2017 ICP, all the participating economies adhered to the general guidelines developed for the ICP at the global and regional levels.

After the establishment of the new ICP global governance structure in 2016, ADB established a revamped regional governing structure to smoothly and efficiently implement the 2017 ICP. Participating economies entered into formal "no objection" agreements with ADB for participation under ADB's technical assistance and financial arrangements. A specially conducted inception workshop with the heads of national implementing agencies from each economy clearly explained these arrangements along with an informal framework of partnership defining roles and responsibilities of ADB and the national implementing agencies. ADB, as the RIA, was responsible for implementing the ICP in Asia and the Pacific, and it received advice and guidance from a specially constituted Regional Advisory Board. The RIA at ADB engaged closely with the ICP teams formed by national implementing agencies, which includes the heads of national statistical agencies and ICP national coordinators of the participating economies. The RIA ensured active participation and close cooperation
among these economies through regular workshops on product specification, ICP methodologies and, more importantly, on validation of price and national accounts data that the participating economies compiled and submitted.

## Participating Economies

The following 22 economies of the region participated in the 2017 ICP cycle for the Asia and Pacific region, with ADB as the RIA: Bangladesh; Bhutan; Brunei Darussalam; Cambodia; Fiji; Hong Kong, China; India; Indonesia; the Lao People's Democratic Republic; Malaysia; Maldives; Mongolia; Myanmar; Nepal; Pakistan; the People's Republic of China; the Philippines; Singapore; Sri Lanka; Taipei,China; Thailand; and Viet Nam.

HOW BIG IS THE INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON PROGRAM FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC?

The International Comparison Program (ICP) for the Asia and Pacific region covers a major share of the world's population within the 22 participating economies: 3.785 billion people out of the world population of 7.511 billion in 2017. According to projections of the size of the real economy from 2011 to 2017, the People's Republic of China is the world's largest economy, with India and Indonesia among the top ten economies by size.

Sources: The regional population is based on population mid-year estimates supplied to ADB by the participating economies for the 2017 ICP; the world population is from the World Development Indicators database. World Bank. World Development Indicators. https://databank.worldbank.org/ source/world-development-indicators (accessed 18 March 2020).

The participating economies were classified into four subregional groups in order to determine product lists for price surveys, data validation, and comparative analysis of regions. Three of the four groups are geographically determined; the fourth is the highincome group, determined by level of development.

- High-income economies. Brunei Darussalam; Hong Kong, China; Singapore; and Taipei,China.
- Mekong. Cambodia; the Lao People's Democratic Republic; Myanmar; Thailand; and Viet Nam.
- South Asia. Bangladesh; Bhutan; India; Maldives; Nepal; Pakistan; and Sri Lanka.
- Southeast Asia and Others. Fiji; Indonesia; Malaysia; Mongolia; the People's Republic of China; and the Philippines.

The results in this report are based on the comparison of prices for more than a thousand well-defined and comparable products and services that represent (i) consumption expenditure of households and the government, and (ii) investments in gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) in these 22 economies.

## Innovations

In implementing the 2017 ICP cycle, the ICP Global Office and the RIAs strictly adhered to the UNSC recommendation to keep the general methodology stable. This recommendation aims in part to ensure that results from the 2017 ICP cycle are comparable with extrapolated results from the 2011 ICP cycle. Working within the general parameters set by the UNSC, ADB introduced innovative methods and tools designed to improve the quality and comparability of basic data used in compiling price and real expenditure comparisons which are discussed in this section.

- Improvements in basic data and methodology for comparing housing expenditure. Comparisons of prices and real expenditures for housing proved problematic in the 2005 and 2011 ICP cycles. The two recommended approaches for housing comparisons-the rental approach and the quantity indicator approach-attempted in the 2005 and 2011 ICP cycles failed to yield plausible relative price and real expenditure comparisons. This problem was largely attributed to gaps in quantity data, incomplete measures of quality indicators, and less reliable rental price data. In the 2017 ICP cycle, the RIA at ADB devoted considerable resources to improving the quality of data for dwelling comparisons.
- First, in addition to collecting data on the three standard quantity indicators (number of dwellings, number of rooms per 100 people, and the number of square meters per person) and the three quality indicators (availability of electricity, inside running water, and private toilets), the RIA enhanced the range of quality indicators by using data collected as a part of the water supply, sanitation, and hygiene indicators that track Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6 , which focuses on water and sanitation. ${ }^{1}$
- Second, the RIA structured and streamlined the collection of rental data during the 2017 ICP cycle. To improve comparability of rental data, the RIA improved the specification of rental dwellings and the scope and coverage of the rental price surveys. Notwithstanding these significant improvements in the quality of data for housing comparisons, the recommended quantity and rental approaches failed to provide plausible price and real expenditure comparisons.
- Finally, the RIA developed a mixed qualityadjusted rental and quantity approach, which was found to be a significant improvement over the existing approaches. However, the Regional Advisory Board for the ICP in Asia and the

[^0]Pacific and the Technical Advisory Group of the ICP at the World Bank recommended deferring implementation of this approach until the 2020 ICP cycle. Accordingly, the RIA at ADB decided to maintain the status quo and make use of the reference volume approach, used in 2005 and 2011, for the 2017 ICP cycle in Asia and the Pacific.

- Enhanced in-house capacity for computation of results. During the 2017 ICP cycle, ADB enhanced in-house computational capacity by developing codes in the statistical software package Stata to replicate results obtained using the tools from the World Bank. Developing independent codes leads to an enhanced understanding of the methods and processes involved in the computation of ICP results, independently checks the results, and ensures that results are replicable. In the coming years, ADB may be able to implement ICP procedures using software tools and/or codes developed completely in-house.
- Enhanced one-on-one communications with national implementing agencies. ADB also introduced new processes during ICP 2017 to communicate with the national implementing agencies. In addition to conducting workshops to interact with implementing agencies to discuss item list preparation, survey framework, and the subsequent data validation, ADB increased the frequency and intensity of one-on-one communications with participating economies. These communications, initially in emails and data file sharing, expanded to include web-based videoconferences to train staff and discuss and resolve outstanding data-related issues. Increased use of videoconference facility achieved the twin goals of increased efficiency and reduced travel and administrative costs. ADB envisages increased use of videoconferencing facilities for workshops, facilitating remote participation during the ICP 2020 cycle.
- An enhanced tool to validate inter-temporal household prices. To validate price data collected by the participating economies, the RIA introduced an enhanced tool that measured the discrepancy between ICP inflation-computed using prices for ICP items priced in both 2011 and 2017 benchmark years-and the basic heading level consumer price index (CPI) inflation over the same period. ADB flagged large observed differences in these two alternative measures of inflation to the concerned implementing agencies for checking the outliers (if any) in ICP product prices for ensuring high data quality of the ICP. The differences would then be indicative of reasons such as suitability of CPIs used and differences in the quality of the ICP products priced in 2017 compared with same products in 2011. The tool further strengthened the standard data validation process, which is based on usual measures of intra-economy and inter-economy variability in prices: the minimum-maximum range for price quotations, coefficient of variation, comparisons of average prices of individual products for an economy with regional and subregional average prices, and the Dikhanov tables. ${ }^{2}$
- Productivity adjustments to government compensation data. In 2005, because of the high disparities observed in the wages and salaries of government employees across economies, the RIA at ADB was the first to recognize the need to introduce productivity adjustments to compare the data on government compensation paid to the employees. ADB pioneered efforts in this direction and implemented a method for productivity adjustment that other regions subsequently adapted and used. In the 2011 ICP cycle, ADB finetuned the methodology and introduced transitive productivity adjustments that were simpler to implement. Intermediate estimates of labor and capital stock as well as the capital share were estimated at the regional level. The ICP Global

[^1]Office made productivity adjustments in the process of global linking, leading to improved price and real expenditure comparisons for government compensation in 2011.

In the 2017 ICP cycle, $A D B$ implemented a refined methodology for adjusting productivity of government employees. ADB recognized that the labor shares used in 2011 were in broad classes and further fine-tuning was necessary to find more reliable estimates of the labor and capital shares. To address these concerns, ADB decided to implement a refined method first described by Robert Inklaar and Marcel Timmer (2013a); because Inklaar played a major role in the development and implementation of the methodology for estimating productivity adjustment factors for government compensation for the 2017 ICP cycle, this
report refers to it as the Inklaar method (Inklaar 2019). The ICP Technical Advisory Group discussed and endorsed this method for the 2017 ICP cycle. Further details of the productivity adjustment methodology are presented in Appendix 1.

The innovations introduced in the 2017 ICP cycle in Asia and the Pacific have resulted in improved and more reliable price and national accounts data thereby enhancing the quality of PPP estimates and real expenditures. Fine-tuning the productivity methodology and the use of more realistic labor and capital shares had a profound effect on the estimates of PPPs and real expenditures for government compensation. These and the flow-on effects on estimates of real government expenditure and real GDP are fully documented in Chapter 5 of this report.

## 3. <br> Purchasing Power Parities and Other Concepts and Measures

## Purchasing Power Parities

The concept of purchasing power parity (PPP) of a currency is critical to all the real expenditure measures compiled by ICP and presented in this report (see Box 3.1).

## Box 3.1: Purchasing Power Parity Defined

A working definition of a PPP is that it represents the number of currency units required to purchase the amounts of goods and services equivalent to what can be bought with one unit of the currency unit of the base or reference or numeraire country (World Bank 2013).

The following example illustrates the meaning of PPP and how it gets measured. Imagine a person from the United States plans to travel to India as a tourist, believing that India is a low-cost tourist destination. Currently, one US dollar (\$), when exchanged in a bank, fetches around 72 Indian rupees (₹). Suppose further that what one can buy with $\$ 1$ in the United States can be purchased with ₹ 25 in India, at least for the main items that interest a tourist-food, accommodation, transport, and shopping. This means a tourist with ₹ 72 (exchanged in a bank for $\$ 1$ ) can buy nearly three times as much in India as can be purchased in the United States for $\$ 1$. Thus, prices in India are roughly onethird of those in the United States. While the exchange rate of ₹ 72 per US dollar can be easily looked up online, it is not always clear how much one needs to spend in India to buy what one dollar buys in the United States. The rate of ₹ 25 per US dollar is the purchasing power
parity or PPP between the US dollar and the Indian rupee: this key figure is provided by the ICP. ${ }^{3}$

Each PPP includes three critical elements. First and foremost, what is the reference (or base) economy and currency? In the example above, the base economy is the United States and the reference currency is the US dollar. Second, what is the currency of the economy for which the PPP is measured? In our example, the Indian rupee is the currency for which PPP is considered. Third, what is the basket of goods? In the example, the basket of goods and services are those that are typically relevant for tourists.

This report refers to economies in Asia and the Pacific, so the reference or base economy also belongs to the region, which has been Hong Kong, China since the 2005 ICP cycle and with Hong Kong dollar as the reference currency. The selection of the base economy and the reference currency is important only for the purpose of presentation but the relative price levels and real and nominal expenditures between any two economies would be the same even if currency of another economy were chosen as the reference currency. The main reasons for the choice of Hong Kong, China as the base economy are: (i) well-functioning market structure without price distortions; (ii) well-developed and broadly-based economy where a large variety of goods and services are available which ensures good overlap of price data with other participating economies; (iii) a strong statistical system for price and national accounts statistics; and, finally, (iv) Hong Kong dollar is a stable currency in the Asia and Pacific region. Throughout the

[^2]rest of this document, the base or reference economy is Hong Kong, China and the reference currency is the Hong Kong dollar (HK\$). ${ }^{4}$

Box 3.2 shows PPPs for the Malaysian ringgit (RM) to the Hong Kong dollar for two different baskets of goods and services. The basket for the first PPP contains only one item, the Big Mac, available in many economies. (The Big Mac Index, which contains PPPs based on the price of the Big Mac in different economies, regularly appears in The Economist.) The second PPP is for monthly household expenditures, a typical basket of goods and services drawn from 2017 ICP data.

The PPP based on the Big Mac is RM0.46 per Hong Kong dollar (HK\$1 = RM0.46), while the PPP for monthly household expenditures is HK\$1 = RM0.28, illustrating that different PPPs are necessary for different items or baskets of items. The Big Mac Index is of limited applicability for comparing the cost of living because it relies on a single item which may not be representative of household consumption.


[^3]
## Uses of Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures

The most important use and main purpose of PPPs is to convert national accounts aggregates into a common currency unit after accounting for price level differences, thus allowing for comparisons of real expenditure levels of gross domestic product (GDP) and its component expenditures across economies. These national accounts aggregates include GDP and its main components-individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH), actual individual consumption by households (AICH), government final consumption expenditure (GFCE), and gross fixed capital formation (GFCF). Different PPPs are needed to convert each of these aggregates.

Per capita levels of real GDP and its various components are useful in several analytical contexts, especially for comparing living standards between economies (definitions of GDP and nominal and real expenditures are provided in the succeeding sections). Measures such as per capita AICH are more appropriate than GDP for comparing living standards or as inputs to poverty measurements. International organizations and national policy makers use PPPs for a variety of purposes. One of the earliest and most important uses of PPPs was to determine an international poverty line to measure global and regional poverty. In 1990, the World Bank used PPPs to construct the $\$ 1 /$ day and $\$ 2 /$ day international poverty lines, which led to the formulation of the first of the Millennium Development Goals, set in 2000, aimed at halving extreme poverty by 2015. In 2015, the member states of the United Nations adopted the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); eliminating extreme poverty continues to be high on that agenda. Apart from the use of the PPPs to monitor poverty, other PPP-based indicators in the SDG framework help monitor income inequality, education and health expenditure, energy intensity, labor productivity, and carbon dioxide emissions per unit of GDP. ADB's policy paper ADB Corporate Results Framework, 2019-2024

[^4](2019) is aligned with the SDG agenda and includes SDG indicators whose measurement depends on PPPs to track development progress in Asia and the Pacific.

Over the last three decades, the United Nations Development Programme has used and continues to use per capita GDP or income in PPP terms to construct the Human Development Index, the Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index, and the Gender Development Index. The International Monetary Fund uses PPP-converted GDP weights to estimate global growth and allocate quotas for member states. The European Commission uses PPP-converted GDP to allocate structural funds intended to decrease economic disparities across its member states.

PPP-converted aggregates are useful for analysis and policy formulation at the economy level. These converted aggregates include real ICEH, real expenditure by government on behalf of individuals (known as individual consumption expenditure by government or ICEG), real collective government consumption, and real investment (GFCF). These aggregates allow us to comparatively analyze price levels and relative levels ofinvestment, competitiveness, and catch-up and convergence within Asia and the Pacific as a region and across economies in different subregions, yielding valuable inputs that can help identify areas for policy intervention. ${ }^{5}$

## Reliability and Limitations of Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures

Users of PPPs must be aware that PPPs are essentially estimates of the purchasing power of currencies based on data collected from price surveys for a comparable basket of large number of goods and services. Therefore, PPPs calculated at the basic heading level are subject to sampling and non-sampling errors and measures of reliability. ${ }^{6}$ National accounts expenditures in local currency units at the basic heading level are
used as weights in calculating PPPs; these expenditures are also subject to similar errors. The reliability of real measures of expenditures also depends upon the relative shares of expenditure aggregates and how reliably they are estimated in national accounts. For example, PPPs and PPP-based expenditures for the aggregate "food" would generally be more reliable than the PPPs and PPP-based expenditures on "bread and cereals", which in turn are expected to be more reliable than for the aggregate "bread" or "rice." Caution therefore must be used in ranking economies based on PPP-converted real GDP and its per capita measures when the differences between economies are small. While it is largely expected that all economies compile their national accounts estimates following the System of National Accounts 2008 (United Nations 2009), the underlying input data may vary in quality and may not adequately capture the unobserved economy such as the informal sector.

PURCHASING POWER PARITIES
AND THE SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT GOALS

While the major use of purchasing
power parities (PPPs) is to compare economic variables such as gross domestic product (GDP), they also have an important role, direct as well as indirect, in monitoring progress toward the attainment of several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). One major use of PPPs in SDGs is the estimation
of poverty incidence based on international poverty line of
\$1.90-a-day.

[^5]Because PPPs are essentially measures of price level differences across different economies covering both traded and non-traded goods and services, these PPPs should not be used for the purpose of determining whether exchange rates of currencies are overvalued or undervalued.

## Exchange Rates

Exchange rates are used to convert the currency of one economy into currencies of other economies and are also known as market exchange rates. An exchange rate for a given currency is the number of local (domestic) currency units per one unit of the reference or foreign currency. Exchange rates depend on a range of factors that affect the demand for and supply of different currencies; therefore, they fluctuate, or could be regulated or managed in some economies. ${ }^{7}$ Individuals use exchange rates for transactions across borders; multinational organizations use them for accounting and transfer of funds. All official monetary transactions, including foreign aid and transfers, use exchange rates. However, exchange rates do not indicate differences in price levels across different economies and, therefore, do not reflect the relative purchasing power of different currencies. Thus, use of exchange rates to compare real income or real expenditure can be misleading.

## The Price Level Index

How do we decide if the price level in one economy is higher or lower compared to another economy? Answering this question means comparing PPPs and exchange rates. Recall that the PPP of a currency shows how many units of that currency are needed to purchase something that can be purchased in a reference economy. For example, the PPP for household consumption in Malaysia is HK\$1 = RM0.28 (see Box 3.2). What does this imply about price level in Malaysia? This question can be answered only by
comparing the PPP of the Malaysian ringgit with the exchange rate, which is HK\$1 = RM0.55. This means that HK $\$ 100$ can be exchanged for RM55 at a bank. However, whatcanbepurchasedinHongKong, Chinafor HK\$100 can be purchased in Malaysia with just RM28, implying that price level in Malaysia is lower than that in Hong Kong, China. Formally, the price level index (PLI) for a given economy is defined as the ratio of its PPP to the exchange rate and is expressed as an index with a base of 100 . Thus, the PLI is defined as:

$$
P L I_{j}=\frac{P P P_{j}}{X R_{j}} \quad \text { where } j \text { refers to an economy }
$$

and the PLI for Malaysia, according to the example, is:

$$
P L I_{\text {Malaysia }}=\frac{0.28}{0.55} \times 100=50.91
$$

This means that the price level for household consumption in Malaysia is lower and roughly half of the price level in Hong Kong, China. By definition, the PLI for the reference economy is always 100 because its PPP and the exchange rate are both equal to 1.

## Price Level Index and Real Exchange Rate

The real exchange rate (RER) is a concept used by economists in the context of foreign trade. The real exchange rate is defined for a domestic currency, Malaysian ringgit in this example, relative to a foreign currency, Hong Kong dollar here. The real exchange rate is derived by adjusting exchange rate, showing the number of foreign currency units (HK\$) per one unit of domestic currency (RM), with the ratio of domestic prices to foreign prices. The ratio of prices in Malaysia to prices in Hong Kong, China is exactly the PPP discussed before, and it is equal to 0.28 . The exchange rate, number of $\mathrm{HK} \$$ per one RM is 1.81 . This is the

[^6]reciprocal of the exchange rate of RM0.55 per HK dollar. Exchange rates can be defined symmetrically as number of RM per HK\$ or number of HK\$ per RM. In the definition of RER, number of HK\$ per RM is used. The real exchange rate, RER, is then given by the following equation:
\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R E R_{R M, H K \$}=X R_{R M, H K \$} \times P P P_{H K \$, R M} \\
= & 1.81 \times 0.28=0.5091=P L I_{\text {Malaysia }}=\frac{P P P_{H K \$, R M}}{X R_{H K \$, R M}}
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

This discussion and the numerical example shows that the concept of real exchange rate for the domestic currency, RM, against the foreign currency, HK\$, used by economists is the same as the price level index for Malaysia expressed relative to Hong Kong, China equal to 1.

## The Price Level Index of Asia and the Pacific

The PLIs of different economies in Asia and the Pacific can also be expressed relative to the region as a whole, with the PLI of Asia and the Pacific at 100 , using a normalization process that guarantees that the real values (converted using PPPs with Asia and the Pacific as the base) and nominal values (converted using exchange rates) of a given aggregate (such as GDP) are the same for the whole region. The PLIs for household consumption reported in Table 4.2 in Chapter 4 shows that with the PLI for Asia and the Pacific at 100, the PLI for Hong Kong, China is 173 and the PLI for Malaysia is 87. This means that prices for household consumption aggregate in Hong Kong, China are well above the regional average but prices in Malaysia are below the regional average. It may be noted that whether the base is Hong Kong, China or the region as a whole, the price level index for household consumption in Malaysia is half of the price level in Hong Kong, China.

## Gross Domestic Product

The ICP aims to provide internationally comparable measures of economic activity in the participating economies. The standards set in the System of National Accounts 2008 (United Nations 2009) guide these measures of economic activity: most of the economies in Asia and the Pacific have adopted the System of National Accounts 2008 and are at various stages of its implementation. GDP is a measure of total economic activity: the market value of all final goods and services produced within an economy in a given period. There are three approaches to measuring GDP: the production approach, the income approach, and the expenditure approach, all yielding same results. For the purposes of the ICP, the expenditure approach is preferred because the collection of prices and GDP expenditure components is more feasible. Also, the expenditure side provides more direct measures of the standards of living of people residing in the participating economies. The accounting period for this ICP report is the calendar year of 2017.

## WHAT IS A PRICE LEVEL <br> INDEX?

A price level index (PLI) for an expenditure aggregate is the ratio of its PPP to the exchange rate and is expressed as an index with a base of 100 . For example, a PLI of 110 for an economy indicates that prices in that economy are on average $10 \%$ higher than the prices in the reference economy, whereas
a PLI of 90 indicates that the
prices are lower by $10 \%$ on
average.

The expenditure side of GDP equals the sum of all the following:

- ICEH (or individual consumption expenditure by households);
- NPISH (or individual consumption expenditure by nonprofit institutions serving households);
- ICEG (or individual consumption expenditure by government);
- CCEG (or collective consumption expenditure by government);
- GFCF (or gross fixed capital formation);
- changes in inventories and net acquisition of valuables; and
- exports less imports.

In the next section, ICP results focus on the following aggregates:

- GDP;
- ICEH and NPISH;

> REAL GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT IN PURCHASING POWER PARITY TERMS

In the International Comparison Program (ICP), real gross domestic product (GDP) or volume of goods and services produced in economies are estimated indirectly by using direct measures of relative prices-the purchasing power parities (PPPs)-that eliminate the differences in the price levels across economies. Thus, the real GDP of an economy is obtained by dividing its GDP in local currency unit by its PPP for GDP.

- AICH (or actual individual consumption by households, which equals ICEH plus NPISH plus ICEG);
- GFCE (or government final consumption expenditure, which equals ICEG plus CCEG; and
- GFCF.


## Nominal versus Real

For each of the aggregates listed above, the ICP provides measures of nominal and real expenditure aggregates. In different economies, statistical offices produce these aggregates and express them in respective local currency units; therefore, we cannot compare these aggregates across economies. Nominal GDP in local currency units of an economy can be converted into a common currency unit using exchange rates:

$$
\text { Nominal GDP }=\frac{\text { GDP in local currency units }}{\text { Exchange rate }}
$$

This aggregate is referred to as nominal since exchange rate simply serves as a currency conversion factor; as such, it does not reflect the price level in the economy.

The real GDP expresses GDP in a common currency unit and at the same time adjusts for price level differences in different economies. The real GDP is obtained by converting GDP in local currency units using the PPP for the economy:

$$
\text { Real GDP }=\frac{\text { GDP in local currency units }}{\text { Purchasing Power Parity }(\mathrm{PPP})}
$$

Both the exchange rate and PPP depend on the reference (or base) currency. If the Hong Kong dollar is the base currency, then the exchange rate and PPP for Hong Kong, China would be equal to 1 , consequently, the nominal GDP, real GDP, and GDP in local currency units are all equal for the base economy.

The same convention for nominal and real applies to all the aggregates described above. For example, we obtain the nominal ICEH by converting the ICEH aggregate in local currency units using the exchange rate; we obtain the real ICEH by converting the ICEH aggregate in local currency units using the corresponding PPPs. A word of caution: the PPP for the GDP aggregate cannot be used to convert ICEH and vice versa. PPPs are specific to the aggregate under consideration.

Nominal aggregates, converted using exchange rates, are additive: the sum of the nominal aggregates of household consumption, consumption by NPISH,
government consumption, GFCF, change in inventories and net acquisition of valuables, and net exports will equal nominal GDP. This additivity property holds because all the component aggregates of GDP are converted using the same exchange rate. This property, additivity of individual aggregates to total GDP, does not hold in the case of real aggregates. Because each real aggregate is converted using a PPP specific to the aggregate, the sum of real values of components of GDP do not equal the real value of GDP. Therefore, real aggregates presented in the tables in Chapter 4 cannot be summed across components. ${ }^{8}$

[^7]
## 4. A Summary of the Results in Asia and the Pacific

## Introduction

Understanding the diversity and complex nature of the Asia and Pacific region will help the readers and users appreciate the 2017 International Comparison Program (ICP) results presented in this chapter. The Asia and Pacific region plays a major role in the world economy. The region holds a major share of the world population: in 2017, the 22 participating economies of the region accounted more than half of the world's population with 3.785 billion inhabitants in the region. ${ }^{9}$ The region is also home to two of the world's most populous economies-India and the People's Republic of China exceeding 1.3 billion eachand also to economies with very small populations like Brunei Darussalam and Maldives with fewer than half a million people each in 2017. Between 2011 and 2017, 14 out of 22 economies grew at an average annual growth rate of more than $5 \%$ with the two largest economies, People's Republic of China and India, respectively growing at an average rate of 7.6\% and $6.8 \%$ per annum. ${ }^{10}$ Economies like Cambodia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, and Mongolia have also posted impressive growth rates exceeding $7.0 \%$ during the same period. The region has some of the richest economies-Brunei Darussalam; Hong Kong, China; and Singapore-with very high per capita incomes and it has economies with some of the lowest per capita incomes like Bangladesh, Nepal, and Myanmar. The economies in the region exhibit considerable disparities in living standards and diversity in consumption patterns. The geographic diversity of the region is equally significant. The region has fully urbanized economies like

Hong Kong, China and Singapore; economies with large land mass like India and the People's Republic of China; island economies like Fiji and Maldives; and landlocked economies like Bhutan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, and Nepal.

The ICP does not include Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, or New Zealand in Asia and the Pacific because they are traditionally included in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) comparisons.

## Key Measures

This chapter presents measures of gross domestic product (GDP) and its components expressed in Hong Kong dollars, the reference currency for comparisons in the region, converted using purchasing power parities of currencies of the 22 participating economies and compiled as a part of the 2017 ICP Cycle in the region. These results provide crucial information for assessing economic performance and for comparing standards of living across economies in the region. Estimates of real size of the economies, measured by real GDP, their shares in the region, and estimates of price levels at the GDP level and at lower levels of aggregates including price levels for different commodity groups such as food, transport, education, health and others are presented in the form of tables and charts. Results from ICP, presented in this chapter, provide valuable information for policy makers, at the national and international levels, pursuing evidence-

[^8]based policy making. A wealth of information is available to users through this Summary Report and from the Main Report which is expected to be released by the middle of 2020 .

GDP-a widely used measure of economic activity recommended in the United Nations' System of National Accounts-is the principal measure in the ICP. Among the three approaches to measuring GDP (production, income, and expenditure), the ICP focuses on the expenditure side of GDP for two reasons. First and foremost, collecting price and expenditure data-necessary for compiling PPPs, real GDP, and its components-is more feasible from the expenditure side than the production side. Second, comparisons of expenditures provide more direct consumptionbased measures of the material well-being of people residing in the participating economies. Comparing per capita real GDP provides valuable information about the cross-economy comparison of average living standards of the population. However, GDP per capita as a measure of cross-economy comparisons also has some known weaknesses. In particular, GDP per capita does not take into account income distribution in an economy. Caution must be exercised in interpreting it as an indicator of overall well-being. Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi (2009) comprehensively discuss the advantages and limitations of GDP, and the need to look beyond it. Their report makes a compelling case for using a dashboard of indicators that reflect several dimensions of economic performance and quality of life, with a special focus on health, education, risk of unemployment, poverty, and security. Notwithstanding their recommendations, per capita GDP continues to be a summary measure which reflects and highly correlates with other dimensions of economic progress and quality of life.

## Summary Results

The following sections provide summary and a brief analysis of the results of 2017 ICP in Asia and the

## REFERENCE CURRENCY FOR

THE REGIONAL COMPARISON
The reference currency unit used
for Asia and the Pacific comparisons
has been the Hong Kong dollar since
the 2005 International Comparison
Program (ICP) round. The
purchasing power parities (PPPs)
and real and nominal expenditures
are therefore expressed in
Hong Kong dollar. The relativities
between economies are not
affected by the choice of reference
currency-it is simply a device for
comparisons.

Pacific. These results relate to the key concepts and measures explained in Chapter 3. Box 4.1 presents some special notes that readers should keep in mind when looking at the ICP results for Asia and the Pacific. The tables in this chapter present PPPs, price level indexes (PLIs), real and nominal expenditures, real and nominal expenditures per capita, real and nominal expenditure per capita indexes, and real and nominal economy shares in Asia and the Pacific. The chapter presents and analyzes key aggregates: GDP, individual consumption expenditure by household (ICEH) and nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH), actual individual consumption by households (AICH), government final consumption expenditure (GFCE), and gross fixed capital formation (GFCF). More detailed expenditure aggregates for the year 2017 as well as the revised tables for 2011 are available in Appendixes 4 and 5. For all tables in this chapter, Hong Kong, China is the reference economy and the Hong Kong dollar (HK\$) is the reference currency, unless otherwise specified. ${ }^{11}$

The core results for real and nominal GDP and respective per capita measures from the 2017 ICP in Asia and the Pacific are in Table 4.1. Column 2

[^9]
## Box 4.1: Notes on Data and Definitions in this Report

- In the tables presented in the report, "Asia and the Pacific" refers to the 22 participating economies in the 2017 International Comparison Program (ICP) for the Asia and Pacific region; coverage of the Pacific is limited to Fiji.
- In the analysis presented in the report, "real" refers to purchasing power parity (PPP)-converted values of expenditure aggregates, while "nominal" refers to exchange rate-converted expenditure values when converted to the Hong Kong dollar.
- Price data for ICP products used in calculating PPP are estimated based on national annual average prices for 2017. Results presented in this report are produced by the ICP Asia Pacific regional implementing agency, based on data supplied by all the participating economies, and in accordance with the methodology recommended by the ICP Technical Advisory Group and approved by the Asia and the Pacific Regional Advisory Board. As such, these results are not produced by participating economies as part of the economies' official statistics. For the 2017 ICP cycle, the estimation methodologies remain the same as in 2011 ICP cycle, with some refinements.
- The gross domestic expenditures in local currency units were disaggregated into 155 basic headings by the participating economies according to the 2017 ICP classification. In many cases in the absence of published or readily available estimates at that basic heading level, higher-level aggregates were required to be split using data and indicators available from household expenditure surveys, government accounts, and other most recent available data sources. Further, in accordance with the ICP guidelines, economies were also required to allocate statistical discrepancy (if any) on the expenditure side to one or more basic headings based on their best judgment. As such the nominal expenditure estimates presented in the tables in this report are the best possible estimates, and some of the expenditure aggregates in this report may be different from the published expenditure estimates by the economies.
- Bangladesh, India, Myanmar, Nepal, and Pakistan compile their gross domestic product (GDP) according to the financial year. As the ICP requires calendar year GDP expenditures from the economies in local currency units, these estimates were converted to calendar year estimates using different approaches depending on the availability of detailed expenditure estimates in each of these economies.
- In some economies, data for household expenditures include the expenditures undertaken by the nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH) because it is difficult to segregate NPISH data, with the exception of the People's Republic of China, where NPISH data is included with government expenditures. In some economies, only total expenditure by NPISH was provided and these were broken down into relevant NPISH components using ratios from household consumption. It may be noted that the NPISH expenditures were not allocated to household expenditures, unlike in the 2011 ICP round, according to the decision taken by the Inter-Agency Coordination Group for uniform treatment of NPISH expenditures by all regional implementing agencies.
- Net purchases abroad, although available as a separate estimate in some economies, were not distributed to household expenditure's international tourism-related basic headings, as was done in the 2011 ICP round. This was also based on the decision taken by the ICP Inter-Agency Coordination Group for uniform treatment of available data on net purchases abroad to be followed by all regions.
- PPPs and results estimated in this report are based on data finalized and submitted by the implementing agencies from each economy as of January 2020.
- The 2011 ICP results were also revised because of revisions in the estimates of GDP and population and due to the refinements in methods for 2017 ICP, such as methodology for estimating the adjustment factors for the differences in productivity of government, minor changes in ICP classification between 2017 and 2011, revisions in the reference PPPs, and treatment of expenditures by NPISH and on net purchases abroad. The 2011 revised results are produced by the ICP Asia Pacific regional implementing agency, based on data supplied by all the participating economies, and in accordance with the methodology recommended by the ICP Technical Advisory Group and approved by the Asia and the Pacific Regional Advisory Board. As such, these results are not produced by participating economies as part of the economies' official statistics.

Source: Asian Development Bank.
Table 4.1: Summary Results for Gross Domestic Product, 2017 (Hong Kong, China as base)

| Economy | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPPs } \\ (H K \$=1.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exchange } \\ & \text { Rates } \\ & (H K \$=1.00) \end{aligned}$ | Expenditure (HK\$ billion) |  | Expenditure per Capita (HK\$) |  | Expenditure per Capita Indexes |  |  |  | Shares <br> (Asia and the Pacific $=100.00$ ) |  |  | PLIs |  | Reference Data |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Asia and the Pacific $=100$ | HKG = 100 |  | Expenditure |  | Population | Population (million) | Expenditure in LCU (billion) |  |  |
|  |  |  | Based on PPPs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Based on } \\ \text { XRs } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Based on PPPs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Based on } \\ \text { XRs } \end{gathered}$ | Based on PPPs |  |  |  | Based on XRs | Based on PPPs | Based on XRs | Based on PPPs | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Based on } \\ & \text { XRs } \end{aligned}$ | Asia and the Pacific $=100$ | HKG = 100 |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) |
| Bangladesh | 4.95 | 10.32 | 4,272 | 2,047 | 26,401 | 12,654 | 43 | 32 | 7 | 4 | 1.84 | 1.38 | 4.27 | 75 | 48 | 161.80 | 21,131 |
| Bhutan | 3.20 | 8.36 | 52 | 20 | 70,855 | 27,094 | 115 | 69 | 20 | 8 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 60 | 38 | 0.73 | 165 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 0.11 | 0.18 | 156 | 95 | 362,379 | 220,065 | 590 | 560 | 101 | 61 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.01 | 95 | 61 | 0.43 | 17 |
| Cambodia | 237.61 | 519.75 | 378 | 173 | 23,853 | 10,904 | 39 | 28 | 7 | 3 | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.42 | 71 | 46 | 15.85 | 89,831 |
| China, People's Republic of | 0.70 | 0.87 | 117,929 | 94,638 | 85,061 | 68,262 | 139 | 174 | 24 | 19 | 50.76 | 63.57 | 36.62 | 125 | 80 | 1,386.40 | 82,075 |
| Fiji | 0.16 | 0.27 | 71 | 42 | 80,772 | 47,572 | 132 | 121 | 22 | 13 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 92 | 59 | 0.88 | 11 |
| Hong Kong, China | 1.00 | 1.00 | 2,663 | 2,663 | 360,247 | 360,247 | 587 | 916 | 100 | 100 | 1.15 | 1.79 | 0.20 | 156 | 100 | 7.39 | 2,663 |
| India | 3.43 | 8.36 | 48,395 | 19,893 | 36,965 | 15,194 | 60 | 39 | 10 | 4 | 20.83 | 13.36 | 34.58 | 64 | 41 | 1,309.20 | 166,226 |
| Indonesia | 781.12 | 1,716.98 | 17,394 | 7,913 | 66,419 | 30,217 | 108 | 77 | 18 | 8 | 7.49 | 5.32 | 6.92 | 71 | 45 | 261.89 | 13,587,213 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 463.97 | 1,071.64 | 303 | 131 | 43,944 | 19,026 | 72 | 48 | 12 | 5 | 0.13 | 0.09 | 0.18 | 68 | 43 | 6.90 | 140,698 |
| Malaysia | 0.28 | 0.55 | 4,916 | 2,453 | 153,532 | 76,589 | 250 | 195 | 43 | 21 | 2.12 | 1.65 | 0.85 | 78 | 50 | 32.02 | 1,353 |
| Maldives | 1.36 | 1.97 | 55 | 38 | 112,187 | 77,137 | 183 | 196 | 31 | 21 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 107 | 69 | 0.49 | 75 |
| Mongolia | 131.66 | 313.06 | 212 | 89 | 67,241 | 28,278 | 110 | 72 | 19 | 8 | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 66 | 42 | 3.15 | 27,876 |
| Myanmar | 61.00 | 174.56 | 1,409 | 493 | 26,519 | 9,268 | 43 | 24 | 7 | 3 | 0.61 | 0.33 | 1.40 | 55 | 35 | 53.15 | 85,981 |
| Nepal | 5.20 | 13.41 | 503 | 195 | 17,431 | 6,754 | 28 | 17 | 5 | 2 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.76 | 60 | 39 | 28.83 | 2,611 |
| Pakistan | 5.59 | 13.53 | 5,954 | 2,459 | 29,905 | 12,349 | 49 | 31 | 8 | 3 | 2.56 | 1.65 | 5.26 | 64 | 41 | 199.11 | 33,270 |
| Philippines | 3.22 | 6.47 | 4,902 | 2,444 | 46,721 | 23,295 | 76 | 59 | 13 | 6 | 2.11 | 1.64 | 2.77 | 78 | 50 | 104.92 | 15,808 |
| Singapore | 0.15 | 0.18 | 3,171 | 2,637 | 564,960 | 469,907 | 921 | 1,195 | 157 | 130 | 1.36 | 1.77 | 0.15 | 130 | 83 | 5.61 | 467 |
| Sri Lanka | 8.22 | 19.56 | 1,621 | 681 | 75,587 | 31,748 | 123 | 81 | 21 | 9 | 0.70 | 0.46 | 0.57 | 66 | 42 | 21.44 | 13,317 |
| Taipei,China | 2.62 | 3.91 | 6,688 | 4,480 | 283,878 | 190,165 | 463 | 484 | 79 | 53 | 2.88 | 3.01 | 0.62 | 105 | 67 | 23.56 | 17,501 |
| Thailand | 2.14 | 4.36 | 7,232 | 3,548 | 106,892 | 52,444 | 174 | 133 | 30 | 15 | 3.11 | 2.38 | 1.79 | 77 | 49 | 67.65 | 15,452 |
| Viet Nam | 1,230.21 | 2,870.44 | 4,069 | 1,744 | 43,179 | 18,506 | 70 | 47 | 12 | 5 | 1.75 | 1.17 | 2.49 | 67 | 43 | 94.24 | 5,005,975 |
| Asia and the Pacific | n.a. | n.a. | 232,344 | 148,874 | 61,375 | 39,326 | 100 | 100 | 17 | 11 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100 | n.a. | 3,785.65 | n.a. |

[^10] estimates supplied by the participating economies for the 2017 International Comparison Program.
shows PPPs of currencies at GDP level: the number of currency units that have the same purchasing power as one Hong Kong dollar. For example, in the case of Indonesia, the PPP indicates that 781.12 rupiah ( Rp ) have the same purchasing power as one Hong Kong dollar (HK\$1 = Rp781.12). In contrast, the exchange rate is $\mathrm{HK} \$ 1=\mathrm{Rp1}, 716.98$ (column 3), which indicates that the average price levels in Indonesia for goods and services in the GDP are much lower than in Hong Kong, China. This is true for each of the 21 economies (excluding Hong Kong, China); the PPPs of each of these are lower than their respective exchange rates, regardless of the size or relative level of development of the economies concerned (columns 2 and 3). This means that each of the 21 economies has price levels lower than those of Hong Kong, China (column 16; also refer to the discussion on price level index in this chapter).

In the table, the relative sizes of the economiestheir real GDPs, which are obtained by dividing their respective GDPs in local currency units by their corresponding PPPs-are in column 4, while their nominal GDPs, or GDP converted using exchange rates, are in column 5. The GDP of Asia and the Pacific is HK\$232.344 trillion in real (or PPP) terms, but only HK\$148.874 trillion in nominal (or exchange rate) terms, a significant difference that results from the fact that PPPs (with respect to the Hong Kong dollar) for every economy are lower than the exchange rates. To

## COMPARISONS ARE

INDEPENDENT OF THE UNITS USED

Results can be expressed in a reference currency or as index numbers, but the relativities between economies do not change when different units are used for the comparison.
gain a proper perspective on the real and nominal size of the economy of Asia and the Pacific, it is necessary to compare it with other regions. The report to be prepared by the World Bank's ICP Global Office will present these comparisons.

## Real and Nominal Levels of Gross Domestic Product and Rankings

Figure 4.1 shows the relative sizes of the economies in real and nominal terms and demonstrates the differences in nominal and real GDP estimates. For all economies, real GDP is larger than nominal GDP, except in the case of Hong Kong, China where, as constructed, nominal and real GDP are the same (for Hong Kong, China, PPP = exchange rate = 1).

Table 4.1 (column 4) further shows that, among the participating economies of Asia and the Pacific, the People's Republic of China is the largesteconomy by far, with a real GDP of HK $\$ 117.9$ trillion, followed by India with HK\$48.4 trillion and Indonesia with HK\$17.4 trillion. In contrast, the smallest economies are Bhutan at HK $\$ 52$ billion, Maldives at HK $\$ 55$ billion, and Fiji HK\$71 billion. This shows wide differences in the sizes of the economies of this region, where economies differ in size by a factor of about 2,300 between the largest (the People's Republic of China) and the smallest (Bhutan), according to real GDP. High-income economies such as Singapore and Hong Kong, China are essentially cities with small economies and populations.

The distribution of real and nominal GDP in the form of shares of different economies in the region are in Figure 4.2. The 12 economies shown in Figure 4.2 together account for nearly $98.0 \%$ of the real GDP and $98.7 \%$ of the nominal GDP expenditure of all participating 22 economies in Asia and the Pacific, with remaining 10 small economies accounting for only about $2.0 \%$ and $1.3 \%$ of the real and nominal GDP respectively. The shares of the top three economies in real terms are $50.76 \%$ for the People's Republic of China, $20.83 \%$ for India, and $7.49 \%$ for Indonesia. The People's Republic of China's share is nearly seven

Figure 4.1: Real and Nominal Gross Domestic Product, 2017 (HK\$ billion)


GDP = gross domestic product, HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar, PRC = People's Republic of China.
Source: Table 4.1.

Figure 4.2: Economy Shares of Real and Nominal Gross Domestic Product, 2017 (\%)


GDP = gross domestic product, PRC = People's Republic of China.
Source: Table 4.1.

## GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT

When estimated from the expenditure side, gross domestic product (GDP) is defined as the total value of the final consumption expenditures of households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and general government plus gross capital formation plus balance of exports and imports.
times that of Indonesia. These are also the most populous economies of the region with shares of 36.62\% (People's Republic of China), 34.58\% (India), and $6.92 \%$ (Indonesia). Thus, the three economies together account for $79.08 \%$ of the region's GDP and $78.12 \%$ the region's population. India is ranked second in terms of total real GDP, but the real size of the Indian economy is only $41 \%$ of the People's Republic of China's economy. Because both economies have almost similar population sizes, India is ranked well below the People's Republic of China in terms of per capita real GDP.

Source: World Bank 2015.

Figure 4.3: Rankings for Real and Nominal Gross Domestic Product, 2017


BAN = Bangladesh; BHU = Bhutan; BRU = Brunei Darussalam; CAM = Cambodia; FIJ = Fiji; HKG = Hong Kong, China; $\operatorname{IND}=\operatorname{India} ; \operatorname{INO}=$ Indonesia; LAO = Lao People's Democratic Republic; MAL = Malaysia; MLD = Maldives; MON = Mongolia; MYA = Myanmar; NEP = Nepal; PAK = Pakistan; PHI = Philippines; PRC = People's Republic of China; SIN = Singapore; SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei,China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

When the economies are ranked by size, both real and nominal, we can see that rankings based on real and nominal GDP are identical for the three largest and three smallest economies, as shown in Figure 4.3. In contrast, the high-income economies have significantly different rankings in real and nominal terms. Singapore is ranked 7th in nominal terms but drops to 11th in real terms; and Hong Kong, China is ranked 6th in nominal terms but 12th in real terms. Other medium-sized economies have smaller shifts in rankings.

The per capita GDP-an indicator of the standard of living or affluence of people in different economiesvaries by a factor of 32.4 in per capita real GDP and a
factor of 69.6 in per capita nominal GDP respectively between Singapore, the richest economy in terms of per capita GDP, and Nepal, the poorest, as shown in Figure 4.4.

Table 4.1 shows that the average per capita real GDP for the region is $\mathrm{HK} \$ 61,375$ as against $\mathrm{HK} \$ 39,326$ in nominal terms. The four economies with the highest per capita real GDP are, from highest to lowest, Singapore (HK\$564,960); Brunei Darussalam (HK\$362,379); Hong Kong, China (HK\$360,247); and Taipei,China (HK\$283,878); they are also the top four in terms of per capita GDP in nominal terms. At the other end of the spectrum, Myanmar (HK\$26,519), Bangladesh

Figure 4.4: Per Capita Real and Nominal Gross Domestic Product, 2017 (HK\$)


GDP = gross domestic product, HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar, Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, PRC = People's Republic of China.
Source: Table 4.1.
(HK\$26,401), Cambodia (HK\$23,853), and Nepal (HK $\$ 17,431$ ) are the four lowest ranked economies by per capita real GDP. Although the People's Republic of China and India are the two largest economies in real GDP, the People's Republic of China is ranked 8th and India is 17 th in terms of per capita real GDP.

The Lorenz curve in Figure 4.5 plots the cumulative percentage shares of expenditures against the cumulative percentage shares of population of the economies in Asia and the Pacific, starting in order from the economy with lowest per capita GDP to the highest. The 45 degree line represents the line of equality; the area between the line of equality and the line representing per capita distribution represents the inequality.

The distribution of per capita GDP is more equal when real GDP is used in comparison with the nominal GDP,

Figure 4.5: Lorenz Curves for Per Capita Real and Nominal Gross Domestic Product, 2017

a Expenditure is represented by the economy-specific per capita gross domestic product.
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.
as shown in Figure 4.5. This is consistent with the fact that PPPs are significantly lower than exchange rates for low-income economies. It may be noted that the Lorenz curves in Figure 4.5 only measure inequality in the distribution of income where only economyspecific per capita GDP and population size are considered and do not account for inequality within each of the 22 economies. These Lorenz curves also show that the poorest $40 \%$ of the population in the region accounts for around $22 \%$ of real GDP of the region whereas they account for only about $14 \%$ of the nominal GDP of the region.

The PLIs in Table 4.1 for GDP show that Hong Kong, China with a PLI of 156 (with Asia and the Pacific $=100$ ) has the highest price levels in the region followed by Singapore (130) and the People's Republic of China (125). The lowest price levels are in Myanmar at 55 followed by Bhutan and Nepal at 60 each. Finally, the PLIs (with Asia and the Pacific $=100$ ) are presented against per capita real GDP (in log scale) in Figure 4.6. ${ }^{12}$ The clear positive association between PLIs and per capita real GDP implies that price levels tend to be high in richer economies, generally referred to as the Penn effect. The fitted line shows a significant positive slope. ${ }^{13}$ It shows the expected PLI for an economy with a given level of per capita real GDP. The figure shows that Hong Kong, China; Maldives; and the People's Republic of China exhibit price levels well above the expected PLIs implied by the fitted line. At the other end of the spectrum, a number of middleand low-income economies, such as India, Indonesia, Myanmar, and Viet Nam, exhibit lower than expected price levels.

## Household Final Consumption

Household final consumption is a general indicator of material well-being because it represents the total volume of goods and services consumed by households. As discussed in Chapter 3, household consumption

[^11]Figure 4.6: Price Level Index versus Per Capita Real Gross Domestic Product, 2017


BAN = Bangladesh; BHU = Bhutan; BRU = Brunei Darussalam; CAM = Cambodia; FIJ = Fiji; HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar; HKG = Hong Kong, China; IND = India; INO = Indonesia; LAO = Lao People's Democratic Republic; MAL = Malaysia; MLD = Maldives; MON = Mongolia; MYA = Myanmar; NEP = Nepal; PAK = Pakistan; PHI = Philippines; PRC = People's Republic of China; SIN = Singapore; SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei,China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.
may be undertaken by households themselves, known as individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) or by nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH). In addition to these, there is individual consumption expenditure by government (ICEG) on behalf of households, typically on housing, health, education, and recreation and cultural services. The sum of ICEH, NPISH, and ICEG is referred to as the actual individual consumption by households (AICH). In any economy, AICH provides a comprehensive measure of the total volume of goods and services consumed by households, regardless of who pays for it. However, the relative proportions of ICEH, NPISH, and ICEG tend to vary across economies in the region as governments in some economies tend to be proactive and provide services aimed at low-income households.

## Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households

Estimates of PPPs, PLIs, real and nominal expenditures of ICEH, and per capita expenditures are in Table 4.2.

It may be noted that in the discussions that follow, ICEH is inclusive of the expenditures by NPISH.

## PER CAPITA

The Latin term "per capita" is loosely translated to English as "by head."
A per capita figure is calculated by
dividing an economic aggregate, for
example, gross domestic product
(GDP), by the total population to
approximate as an income-based
measure of average "standard of
living" of residents in an economy.
Although interpreted as "per
person," per capita GDP does not
provide information as to how
income is distributed across the
population within an economy.
Table 4.2: Summary Results for Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households, 2017 (Hong Kong, China as base)

| Economy | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPPs } \\ (H K \$=1.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exchange } \\ & \text { Rates } \\ & (H K \$=1.00) \end{aligned}$ | Expenditure (HK\$ billion) |  | Expenditure per Capita (HK\$) |  | Expenditure per Capita Indexes |  |  |  | Shares <br> (Asia and the Pacific $=100.00$ ) |  |  | PLIs |  | Reference Data |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Asia and the Pacific $=100$ | HKG = 100 |  | Expenditure |  | Population | Population (million) | Expenditure in LCU (billion) |  |  |
|  |  |  | Based on PPPs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Based on } \\ \text { XRs } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Based on | Based on XRs | Based on PPPs |  |  |  | Based on XRs | Based on | Based on XRs | Based on PPPs | Based on XRs | Asia and the Pacific $=100$ | HKG = 100 |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) |
| Bangladesh | 4.73 | 10.32 | 3,120 | 1,429 | 19,282 | 8,833 | 62 | 49 | 8 | 4 | 2.66 | 2.12 | 4.27 | 79 | 46 | 161.80 | 14,752 |
| Bhutan | 3.28 | 8.36 | 26 | 10 | 36,422 | 14,296 | 118 | 80 | 15 | 6 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 68 | 39 | 0.73 | 87 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 0.11 | 0.18 | 31 | 19 | 71,556 | 45,068 | 231 | 253 | 30 | 19 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 109 | 63 | 0.43 | 3 |
| Cambodia | 238.51 | 519.75 | 303 | 139 | 19,097 | 8,763 | 62 | 49 | 8 | 4 | 0.26 | 0.21 | 0.42 | 80 | 46 | 15.85 | 72,194 |
| China, People's Republic of | 0.66 | 0.87 | 46,611 | 35,703 | 33,620 | 25,753 | 109 | 144 | 14 | 11 | 39.80 | 52.85 | 36.62 | 133 | 77 | 1,386.40 | 30,964 |
| Fiji | 0.16 | 0.27 | 47 | 28 | 53,908 | 32,106 | 174 | 180 | 22 | 13 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 103 | 60 | 0.88 | 7 |
| Hong Kong, China | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1,785 | 1,785 | 241,555 | 241,555 | 781 | 1,354 | 100 | 100 | 1.52 | 2.64 | 0.20 | 173 | 100 | 7.39 | 1,785 |
| India | 3.12 | 8.36 | 31,360 | 11,706 | 23,954 | 8,941 | 77 | 50 | 10 | 4 | 26.78 | 17.33 | 34.58 | 65 | 37 | 1,309.20 | 97,813 |
| Indonesia | 815.39 | 1,716.98 | 9,551 | 4,536 | 36,471 | 17,320 | 118 | 97 | 15 | 7 | 8.16 | 6.71 | 6.92 | 82 | 47 | 261.89 | 7,788,168 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 502.05 | 1,071.64 | 152 | 71 | 22,065 | 10,337 | 71 | 58 | 9 | 4 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.18 | 81 | 47 | 6.90 | 76,447 |
| Malaysia | 0.28 | 0.55 | 2,707 | 1,357 | 84,526 | 42,379 | 273 | 237 | 35 | 18 | 2.31 | 2.01 | 0.85 | 87 | 50 | 32.02 | 749 |
| Maldives | 1.57 | 1.97 | 19 | 15 | 38,688 | 30,743 | 125 | 172 | 16 | 13 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 138 | 79 | 0.49 | 30 |
| Mongolia | 139.95 | 313.06 | 107 | 48 | 33,862 | 15,137 | 109 | 85 | 14 | 6 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 77 | 45 | 3.15 | 14,922 |
| Myanmar | 62.45 | 174.56 | 784 | 281 | 14,750 | 5,278 | 48 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 0.67 | 0.42 | 1.40 | 62 | 36 | 53.15 | 48,963 |
| Nepal | 4.89 | 13.41 | 410 | 149 | 14,212 | 5,180 | 46 | 29 | 6 | 2 | 0.35 | 0.22 | 0.76 | 63 | 36 | 28.83 | 2,003 |
| Pakistan | 5.33 | 13.53 | 5,135 | 2,022 | 25,791 | 10,153 | 83 | 57 | 11 | 4 | 4.39 | 2.99 | 5.26 | 68 | 39 | 199.11 | 27,355 |
| Philippines | 3.11 | 6.47 | 3,738 | 1,796 | 35,630 | 17,115 | 115 | 96 | 15 | 7 | 3.19 | 2.66 | 2.77 | 83 | 48 | 104.92 | 11,614 |
| Singapore | 0.17 | 0.18 | 969 | 947 | 172,694 | 168,702 | 558 | 945 | 71 | 70 | 0.83 | 1.40 | 0.15 | 169 | 98 | 5.61 | 168 |
| Sri Lanka | 8.89 | 19.56 | 929 | 422 | 43,335 | 19,698 | 140 | 110 | 18 | 8 | 0.79 | 0.63 | 0.57 | 79 | 45 | 21.44 | 8,263 |
| Taipei,China | 2.66 | 3.91 | 3,484 | 2,372 | 147,894 | 100,673 | 478 | 564 | 61 | 42 | 2.98 | 3.51 | 0.62 | 118 | 68 | 23.56 | 9,265 |
| Thailand | 2.13 | 4.36 | 3,466 | 1,694 | 51,232 | 25,042 | 166 | 140 | 21 | 10 | 2.96 | 2.51 | 1.79 | 85 | 49 | 67.65 | 7,378 |
| Viet Nam | 1,250.81 | 2,870.44 | 2,364 | 1,030 | 25,088 | 10,932 | 81 | 61 | 10 | 5 | 2.02 | 1.52 | 2.49 | 76 | 44 | 94.24 | 2,957,280 |
| Asia and the Pacific | n.a. | n.a. | 117,100 | 67,560 | 30,933 | 17,846 | 100 | 100 | 13 | 7 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100 | n.a. | 3,785.65 | n.a. |

[^12]Note: In this table, individual consumption expenditure by household (ICEH) includes expenditures by nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH).

[^13]The PPPs (column 2) for ICEH are generally well below the exchange rates (column 3). For example, for India, PPP for ICEH is 3.12 Indian rupees (₹) for one Hong Kong dollar, or HK\$1 = ₹ 3.12 , compared to the exchange rate of $\mathrm{HK} \$ 1=₹ 8.36$. The PLIs (with Hong Kong, China $=100$ ), are below 100 for all the economies. Moreover, 15 out of 22 economies have PLIs less than or equal to 50 (column 16). The PLI (with the PLI for Asia and the Pacific $=100$ ) for Hong Kong, China is 173 and six more economies have price levels above the regional level of 100 (column 15). The PLI for the People's Republic of China is $33 \%$ higher than the regional average. The PLIs of Maldives (138)
and Fiji (103) show that the price level in the two island economies is higher than the regional average of 100 by $38 \%$ for Maldives and $3 \%$ for Fiji; price levels in the rich economies of Brunei Darussalam; Hong Kong, China; Singapore; and Taipei,China are also higher than the regional average.

In Table 4.2 (column 4), the total size of real ICEH (in PPP terms) for the region is HK\$117.10 trillion, with the highest ICEH in the People's Republic of China at HK $\$ 46.61$ trillion and India at HK $\$ 31.36$ trillion. The following figure shows the economies' rankings in nominal and real ICEH.

Figure 4.7: Rankings for Real and Nominal Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households, 2017


[^14]The top five ranked economies in terms of real ICEH from highest to lowest are the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, and the Philippines; meanwhile, the bottom ranked economies from lowest to highest are Maldives, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, and Fiji. Differences in rankings based on nominal and real ICEH are generally small, except for Hong Kong, China, which has a much lower ranking in real terms.

The per capita ICEH are important when it comes to comparing material well-being of the economies. In Table 4.2, except for reference economy (Hong Kong, China), each economy's per capita nominal ICEH (column 7) is lower than its per capita real ICEH (column 6) arising from the fact that each PPP for ICEH (column 2) is lower than the exchange
rate (column 3). This further implies that the reference economy has the highest price level for ICEH (columns 15 and 16). For the region, per capita nominal ICEH is HK $\$ 17,846$, while per capita real ICEH is $\mathrm{HK} \$ 30,933$.

Rankings of the economies based on per capita real ICEH differ significantly from the rankings based on total real ICEH. By per capita real and nominal ICEH, the top ranked economies are Hong Kong, China; Singapore; Taipei,China; Malaysia; and Brunei Darussalam, as Figure 4.8 shows. The People's Republic of China has a somewhat lower rank of 14th compared to its rank based on per capita real GDP. India is ranked 17th based on per capita real ICEH, the same as its per capita rank for per capita real GDP.

Figure 4.8: Per Capita Real and Nominal Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households, 2017 (HK\$)


HK \$ = Hong Kong dollar, ICEH = individual consumption expenditure by households, Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, PRC = People's Republic of China. Note: In this figure, individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) includes expenditures by nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH). Source: Table 4.2.

A comparison of the results in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2 respectively for GDP and ICEH suggests that there are economies where per capita GDP is high but per capita ICEH is relatively low. Figure 4.9 shows per capita real GDP and ICEH for the 22 participating economies. By definition, per capita ICEH is always lower than per capita GDP. However, from the figure it can be seen that per capita ICEH is significantly lower for Brunei Darussalam and Singapore. The People's Republic of China and Maldives follow a similar pattern, but of relatively lower magnitude. Economies with a significant trade balance or with large investment outlays in their GDPs, relatively have lower levels of ICEH. Economies with a large GFCF may have higher potential for future growth.

The many possible explanations for these differences require further analysis.

## Actual Individual Consumption by Households

A comprehensive measure of goods and services consumed by the households is the actual individual consumption by households (AICH), which includes ICEH and NPISH on behalf of individuals, as well as government expenditure on behalf of households, or ICEG. Therefore, AICH is a better measure of material well-being than the overall GDP as this includes all goods and services consumed by the households to meet their individual consumption needs.

Figure 4.9: Per Capita Real Gross Domestic Product and Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households, 2017 (HK\$)


GDP = gross domestic product, HK $\$=$ Hong Kong dollar, ICEH = individual consumption expenditure by households, Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, NPISH = nonprofit institutions serving households, PRC = People's Republic of China.
Note: In this figure, individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) includes expenditures by nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH). Source: Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Table 4.3 shows estimates of per capita real AICH for the participating economies.

The last column shows that the ratio (expressed as a percentage) of per capita real AICH to per capita real GDP varies from a very high of $92.29 \%$ to a low of $26.80 \%{ }^{14}$ This ratio is likely to be high for low-income economies. The highest ratios are $92.29 \%$ in Pakistan,
$88.72 \%$ in Cambodia, $86.29 \%$ in Nepal, and $83.29 \%$ in the Philippines. Brunei Darussalam has the lowest ratio of $26.80 \%$, as expected for a resource-rich economy with a significant contribution from net exports to GDP. While Singapore has a low ratio of $34.09 \%$; Hong Kong, China has a relatively higher ratio of $70.87 \%$.

Table 4.3: Per Capita Real Actual Individual Consumption by Households, 2017
(Hong Kong, China as base)

| Economy | Per Capita Real GDP | Per Capita Real AICH |  | Ratio of per Capita Real AICH to GDP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Levels (HK\$) | Levels (HK\$) | Index <br> (Asia and the Pacific $=100$ ) |  |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| Bangladesh | 26,401 | 20,301 | 57 | 76.89 |
| Bhutan | 70,855 | 43,196 | 122 | 60.96 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 362,379 | 97,121 | 274 | 26.80 |
| Cambodia | 23,853 | 21,161 | 60 | 88.72 |
| China, People's Republic of | 85,061 | 41,613 | 117 | 48.92 |
| Fiji | 80,772 | 60,057 | 169 | 74.35 |
| Hong Kong, China | 360,247 | 255,310 | 720 | 70.87 |
| India | 36,965 | 25,118 | 71 | 67.95 |
| Indonesia | 66,419 | 40,391 | 114 | 60.81 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 43,944 | 25,055 | 71 | 57.02 |
| Malaysia | 153,532 | 95,858 | 270 | 62.43 |
| Maldives | 112,187 | 47,964 | 135 | 42.75 |
| Mongolia | 67,241 | 41,482 | 117 | 61.69 |
| Myanmar | 26,519 | 16,267 | 46 | 61.34 |
| Nepal | 17,431 | 15,041 | 42 | 86.29 |
| Pakistan | 29,905 | 27,599 | 78 | 92.29 |
| Philippines | 46,721 | 38,916 | 110 | 83.29 |
| Singapore | 564,960 | 192,614 | 543 | 34.09 |
| Sri Lanka | 75,587 | 51,965 | 146 | 68.75 |
| Taipei,China | 283,878 | 173,917 | 490 | 61.26 |
| Thailand | 106,892 | 62,106 | 175 | 58.10 |
| Viet Nam | 43,179 | 28,955 | 82 | 67.06 |
| Asia and the Pacific | 61,375 | 35,472 | 100 | 57.80 |

[^15][^16]The Lorenz curves for real GDP, ICEH, and AICH show that the distribution of real ICEH and NPISH is more equal than the distribution of GDP and the distribution of AICH (Figure 4.10).

Figure 4.10: Lorenz Curves for Per Capita Real Gross Domestic Product and Per Capita Real Consumption by Households, 2017

$\mathrm{AICH}=$ actual individual consumption by households, GDP = gross domestic product, ICEH = individual consumption expenditure by households, NPISH = nonprofit institutions serving households.
a Expenditure is represented by the economy-specific per capita expenditure (GDP, ICEH and NPISH, AICH.)
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

## Government Final Consumption Expenditure

The government final consumption expenditure (GFCE) is the sum of ICEG on individual services such as health and education, and collective consumption expenditure by government on collective services such as general administration, defense, police, firefighting, and environmental protection. Comparative analysis of per capita real GFCE and its components provide useful insights into how different governments play different roles in their respective economies.

Table 4.4 presents PPPs, PLIs, and per capita (real and nominal) government expenditure for all the participating economies, with PPPs (column 2), which are generally quite low compared to exchange rates (column 3). PPPs for the general government are driven in large part by wages and salaries for government employees and, considering productivity differences across economies, adjustment factors were applied following Inklaar (2019) (see Appendix 1 for details). Despite adjusting for productivity levels of government employees in different economies, PPPs for government tend to be low compared with PPPs for GDP, and PLIs are accordingly low. The PLIs for all economies are lower than Hong Kong, China (set at 100). The lowest PLI of 17 belongs to Sri Lanka, followed by 19 for Bhutan, and 20 for Mongolia. Low PPPs for government imply relatively large per capita real expenditures. In terms of per capita real GFCE, Brunei Darussalam (HK\$149,626) is the highest, followed by Singapore (HK\$66,233) with less than half the per capita real GFCE of Brunei Darussalam. Brunei Darussalam's per capita real GFCE is almost 17 times that of region's per capita real GFCE.

## Gross Fixed Capital Formation

GFCF is an important component of GDP from a policy perspective. GFCF represents investments, which comprises the acquisition and disposals of following categories of assets: machinery and equipment, construction, and other products. The 2017 ICP cycle introduced a few changes to the classification of GFCF components, combining the basic headings of "motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers" and "other road transport" of 2011 into a single basic heading, "road transport equipment," in 2017. In addition, the heading "other manufactured goods not elsewhere classified" of 2011 was combined with "other products" in 2017 (see Appendix 6, Figure A6.1).
(Hong Kong, China as base)
Table 4.4: Summary Results for Government Final Consumption Expenditure, 2017
(Hong Kong, China as base)

| Economy | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPPs } \\ (H K \$=1.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exchange } \\ & \text { Rates } \\ & (H K \$=1.00) \end{aligned}$ | Expenditure (HK\$ billion) |  | Expenditure per Capita (HK\$) |  | Expenditure per Capita Indexes |  |  |  | Shares <br> (Asia and the Pacific $=100.00$ ) |  |  | PLls |  | Reference Data |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Asia and the Pacific $=100$ | HKG = 100 |  | Expenditure |  | Population | Population (million) | Expenditure in LCU (billion) |  |  |
|  |  |  | Based on PPPs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Based on } \\ \text { XRs } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Based on PPPs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Based on } \\ \text { XRs } \end{gathered}$ | Based on PPPs |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Based on } \\ & \text { XRs } \end{aligned}$ | Based on PPPs | $\begin{gathered} \text { Based on } \\ \text { XRs } \end{gathered}$ | Based on | $\begin{gathered} \text { Based on } \\ \text { XRs } \end{gathered}$ | Asia and the $\text { Pacific }=100$ | HKG = 100 |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) | (14) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (18) |
| Bangladesh | 4.11 | 10.32 | 318 | 127 | 1,966 | 783 | 22 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 0.94 | 0.60 | 4.27 | 64 | 40 | 161.80 | 1,308 |
| Bhutan | 1.62 | 8.36 | 17 | 3 | 22,991 | 4,453 | 258 | 80 | 65 | 13 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 31 | 19 | 0.73 | 27 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 0.07 | 0.18 | 64 | 25 | 149,626 | 58,267 | 1,680 | 1,046 | 423 | 165 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 0.01 | 62 | 39 | 0.43 | 4 |
| Cambodia | 183.79 | 519.75 | 41 | 15 | 2,592 | 917 | 29 | 16 | 7 | 3 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.42 | 57 | 35 | 15.85 | 7,552 |
| China, People's Republic of | 0.67 | 0.87 | 19,609 | 15,042 | 14,144 | 10,850 | 159 | 195 | 40 | 31 | 58.17 | 71.34 | 36.62 | 123 | 77 | 1,386.40 | 13,046 |
| Fiji | 0.13 | 0.27 | 15 | 7 | 17,113 | 8,176 | 192 | 147 | 48 | 23 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 76 | 48 | 0.88 | 2 |
| Hong Kong, China | 1.00 | 1.00 | 261 | 261 | 35,374 | 35,374 | 397 | 635 | 100 | 100 | 0.78 | 1.24 | 0.20 | 160 | 100 | 7.39 | 261 |
| India | 4.15 | 8.36 | 4,312 | 2,144 | 3,294 | 1,637 | 37 | 29 | 9 | 5 | 12.79 | 10.17 | 34.58 | 79 | 50 | 1,309.20 | 17,911 |
| Indonesia | 550.85 | 1,716.98 | 2,241 | 719 | 8,558 | 2,746 | 96 | 49 | 24 | 8 | 6.65 | 3.41 | 6.92 | 51 | 32 | 261.89 | 1,234,554 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 236.96 | 1,071.64 | 88 | 20 | 12,806 | 2,832 | 144 | 51 | 36 | 8 | 0.26 | 0.09 | 0.18 | 35 | 22 | 6.90 | 20,941 |
| Malaysia | 0.23 | 0.55 | 712 | 298 | 22,237 | 9,319 | 250 | 167 | 63 | 26 | 2.11 | 1.42 | 0.85 | 67 | 42 | 32.02 | 165 |
| Maldives | 0.96 | 1.97 | 12 | 6 | 24,196 | 11,825 | 272 | 212 | 68 | 33 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 78 | 49 | 0.49 | 11 |
| Mongolia | 61.22 | 313.06 | 58 | 11 | 18,416 | 3,601 | 207 | 65 | 52 | 10 | 0.17 | 0.05 | 0.08 | 31 | 20 | 3.15 | 3,550 |
| Myanmar | 42.51 | 174.56 | 374 | 91 | 7,046 | 1,716 | 79 | 31 | 20 | 5 | 1.11 | 0.43 | 1.40 | 39 | 24 | 53.15 | 15,918 |
| Nepal | 5.05 | 13.41 | 59 | 22 | 2,035 | 766 | 23 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 0.17 | 0.10 | 0.76 | 60 | 38 | 28.83 | 296 |
| Pakistan | 5.27 | 13.53 | 727 | 283 | 3,649 | 1,420 | 41 | 26 | 10 | 4 | 2.16 | 1.34 | 5.26 | 62 | 39 | 199.11 | 3,827 |
| Philippines | 2.88 | 6.47 | 617 | 275 | 5,882 | 2,619 | 66 | 47 | 17 | 7 | 1.83 | 1.30 | 2.77 | 71 | 45 | 104.92 | 1,777 |
| Singapore | 0.13 | 0.18 | 372 | 277 | 66,233 | 49,384 | 744 | 887 | 187 | 140 | 1.10 | 1.31 | 0.15 | 119 | 75 | 5.61 | 49 |
| Sri Lanka | 3.26 | 19.56 | 347 | 58 | 16,177 | 2,696 | 182 | 48 | 46 | 8 | 1.03 | 0.27 | 0.57 | 27 | 17 | 21.44 | 1,131 |
| Taipei, China | 2.07 | 3.91 | 1,191 | 630 | 50,555 | 26,747 | 568 | 480 | 143 | 76 | 3.53 | 2.99 | 0.62 | 85 | 53 | 23.56 | 2,462 |
| Thailand | 1.67 | 4.36 | 1,487 | 569 | 21,978 | 8,414 | 247 | 151 | 62 | 24 | 4.41 | 2.70 | 1.79 | 61 | 38 | 67.65 | 2,479 |
| Viet Nam | 733.48 | 2,870.44 | 788 | 201 | 8,358 | 2,136 | 94 | 38 | 24 | 6 | 2.34 | 0.95 | 2.49 | 41 | 26 | 94.24 | 577,719 |
| Asia and the Pacific | n.a. | n.a. | 33,711 | 21,085 | 8,905 | 5,570 | 100 | 100 | 25 | 16 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100 | n.a. | 3,785.65 | n.a. |

n.a. = not applicable; $H K \$=$ Hong Kong dollar; $H K G=$ Hong Kong, China; $L C U=$ local currency unit; PLI = price level index; PPP = purchasing power parity; XR = exchange rate.
Note: Government compensation data for 2017 for Thailand is estimated by extrapolating government compensation data for 2011 with the deflator of government final consumption expenditure in accordance with the
 estimates supplied by the participating economies for the 2017 International Comparison Program.

Table 4.5 summarizes the results for GFCF. PPPs for GFCF are lower but relatively closer to exchange rates than what was observed for other aggregates. For the region, the per capita real GFCF (HK\$19,795) is
$36 \%$ higher than the nominal GFCF (HK\$14,512). In comparison, the per capita real GDP (HK\$61,375) is $56 \%$ higher than per capita nominal GDP (HK\$39,326).

Table 4.5: Summary of Expenditure on Gross Fixed Capital Formation, 2017
(Hong Kong, China as base)

| Economy | Population (thousand) | Exchange Rates (LCU per HK\$) | Expenditure on GFCF |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Purchasing Power Parity $(H K \$=1.00)$ | Per Capita Nominal GFCF (HK\$) | Per Capita Real GFCF (HK\$) | Per Capita Real Expenditure Index (Asia and the Pacific=100) |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Bangladesh | 161,800 | 10.32 | 6.10 | 3,909 | 6,616 | 33 |
| Bhutan | 727 | 8.36 | 4.53 | 13,903 | 25,672 | 130 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 430 | 0.18 | 0.12 | 90,377 | 132,105 | 667 |
| Cambodia | 15,850 | 519.75 | 273.33 | 1,178 | 2,240 | 11 |
| China, People's Republic of | 1,386,395 | 0.87 | 0.74 | 29,253 | 34,209 | 173 |
| Fiji | 877 | 0.27 | 0.16 | 8,460 | 13,726 | 69 |
| Hong Kong, China | 7,392 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 77,924 | 77,924 | 394 |
| India | 1,309,200 | 8.36 | 3.86 | 4,315 | 9,339 | 47 |
| Indonesia | 261,891 | 1,716.98 | 830.33 | 9,720 | 20,099 | 102 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 6,901 | 1,071.64 | 565.52 | 6,355 | 12,042 | 61 |
| Malaysia | 32,023 | 0.55 | 0.29 | 19,329 | 37,035 | 187 |
| Maldives | 492 | 1.97 | 1.26 | 32,266 | 50,477 | 255 |
| Mongolia | 3,149 | 313.06 | 166.96 | 6,968 | 13,066 | 66 |
| Myanmar | 53,150 | 174.56 | 71.07 | 2,861 | 7,026 | 35 |
| Nepal | 28,830 | 13.41 | 7.14 | 2,149 | 4,033 | 20 |
| Pakistan | 199,110 | 13.53 | 7.08 | 1,835 | 3,505 | 18 |
| Philippines | 104,921 | 6.47 | 3.85 | 5,826 | 9,799 | 50 |
| Singapore | 5,612 | 0.18 | 0.15 | 124,067 | 151,506 | 765 |
| Sri Lanka | 21,444 | 19.56 | 10.70 | 8,349 | 15,270 | 77 |
| Taipei,China | 23,560 | 3.91 | 2.93 | 38,947 | 51,992 | 263 |
| Thailand | 67,654 | 4.36 | 2.34 | 11,906 | 22,173 | 112 |
| Viet Nam | 94,240 | 2,870.44 | 1,497.52 | 4,401 | 8,435 | 43 |
| Asia and the Pacific | 3,785,647 | n.a. | n.a. | 14,512 | 19,795 | 100 |

n.a. = not applicable, GFCF = gross fixed capital formation, HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar, LCU = local currency unit.

Sources: Asian Development Bank estimates. For exchange rates: International Monetary Fund. International Financial Statistics. http://data.imf.org/ (accessed 17 September 2019). Data for population refers to mid-year estimates supplied by the participating economies for the 2017 International Comparison Program.

Shares of real and nominal GFCFs of the economies in the GFCF of Asia and the Pacific are shown in Figure 4.11. Twelve economies shown in Figure 4.11 account for nearly $99.0 \%$ of the share of GFCF in the region with 10 smaller economies accounting for only about $1.0 \%$ share. The nominal share for the People's Republic of China is greater than its real share. In both nominal and real terms, the People's Republic
of China's share is quite high, and is more than $60 \%$ of the GFCF for the region. Though India is second ranked in GFCF share, its share in real GFCF is roughly onefourth of the share of the People's Republic of China; and in nominal terms India's share is only about $14 \%$ of the share of the People's Republic of China. Indonesia, ranked third, has a greater share than Taipei,China and other middle- to high-income economies.

Figure 4.11: Nominal and Real Shares for Gross Fixed Capital Formation, 2017 (\%)


GFCF = Gross Fixed Capital Formation, PRC = People's Republic of China.
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

## 5. Consistency between the 2011 and 2017 Comparisons

This chapter examines consistency of the 2017 International Comparison Program (ICP) results with the 2011 ICP results. In order to provide a meaningful comparison with results from the 2017 ICP, it was considered necessary to revise the 2011 ICP results by taking into account: revisions in national accounts data; minor changes in classification used in 2017; and minor refinements to methodology introduced during the 2017 ICP cycle. The next section explains the process of updating and revising the 2011 ICP results. The last section examines consistency by comparing results from the 2017 benchmark with extrapolations from the revised 2011 results derived using appropriate indicators.

## Updating and Revising the 2011 Cycle Results

The ICP primarily uses data on annual average prices of a basket of goods and services, gross domestic product (GDP) broken down by 155 expenditure basic headings, and to a lesser degree, population data compiled by the participating economies. As 2011 ICP price comparisons reflect prices in 2011, the price data used in estimating the purchasing power parities (PPPs) for the basic headings remain fixed. Thus, the major sources for the 2011 update are revised population data, revised expenditure data at the GDP and basic heading levels, changes in basic headings used for reference PPPs, refinements introduced in 2017 to productivity adjustment methodology for government compensation, and the effects of those changes on comparisons of government compensation.

Revisions to population and gross domestic product data. Table 5.1 shows the revisions in the population and GDP estimates for 2011. Generally, population data remains stable and is revised only when new information from a more recent population census or a demographic survey serves as the basis for adjusting or revising population estimates. Changes in population size do not affect the PPPs but obviously do affect per capita figures.

Revisions to the population figures for 2011 are minimal for most of the economies, except for a big spike in the population of Maldives, due to a revised counting system where expatriates are now included in the resident population, and a downward revision of population in Myanmar based on new data from the Population and Housing Census of 2014-the first population census held in 30 years.

## REVISIONS IN 2011 ICP RESULTS

- Revised population data
- Revised expenditure data at the GDP and basic heading levels
- Refinements made to productivity adjustment methodology in 2017
- Changes in basic headings used for reference PPPs

Table 5.1 also reflects revisions in the estimates of GDP for economies participated in the 2011 ICP Asia and the Pacific. Most of the observed revisions are upward and some economies have reported significant changes to GDP estimates and the underlying structure. Maldives has the biggest upward revision, about 28\%, mainly due to rebasing and implementing the 2008 System of National Accounts, along with improved methodology and data sources. Other economies with revisions exceeding 5\% are Brunei Darussalam, Fiji, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Indonesia, and Sri Lanka. GDP revisions stem from a range of
factors, including implementation of the 2008 System of National Accounts, reclassifications in national accounts, more exhaustive coverage of the economy, and more importantly, new input data from various censuses, including economic censuses and household and enterprise surveys in different economies.

## Revisions due to changes in productivity adjustment

 methodology. During the 2017 ICP cycle, the Technical Advisory Group and the Inter-Agency Coordination Group considered the methodology proposed in Inklaar and Timmer (2013a) and the practical proposalTable 5.1: Comparison of Original and Revised Population, Gross Domestic Product, Productivity Adjustment Factors, and Purchasing Power Parities, 2011

| Economy | Population (thousands) |  |  | GDP in LCU (billions) |  |  | Productivity Adjustment Factors(HKG=1.00) |  |  | Purchasing Power Parities$(H K \$=1.00)$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Original | Revised | Ratio of Revised to Original | Original | Revised | Ratio of Revised to Original | ADB (revised) Method | Inklaar <br> Method | Ratio of Inklaar to ADB | Original | Revised | Ratio of Revised to Original |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | (12) | (13) |
| Bangladesh | 149,700 | 149,700 | 1.00 | 9,703 | 9,855 | 1.02 | 0.33 | 0.21 | 0.62 | 4.24 | 4.47 | 1.06 |
| Bhutan | 708 | 680 | 0.96 | 86 | 85 | 0.99 | 0.72 | 0.44 | 0.61 | 3.09 | 3.13 | 1.02 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 393 | 393 | 1.00 | 21 | 23 | 1.11 | 1.30 | 1.21 | 0.93 | 0.13 | 0.13 | 1.03 |
| Cambodia | 14,226 | 14,307 | 1.01 | 52,069 | 52,069 | 1.00 | 0.26 | 0.12 | 0.48 | 246.65 | 262.06 | 1.06 |
| China, People's Republic of | 1,341,981 | 1,344,130 | 1.00 | 47,310 | 48,930 | 1.03 | 0.66 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 0.64 | 0.67 | 1.05 |
| Fiji | 854 | 854 | 1.00 | 7 | 7 | 1.09 | 0.68 | 0.32 | 0.47 | 0.19 | 0.18 | 0.95 |
| Hong Kong, China | 7,072 | 7,072 | 1.00 | 1,936 | 1,934 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| India | 1,215,957 | 1,216,147 | 1.00 | 86,993 | 85,256 | 0.98 | 0.48 | 0.30 | 0.62 | 2.77 | 2.97 | 1.07 |
| Indonesia | 241,038 | 241,991 | 1.00 | 7,422,781 | 7,831,726 | 1.06 | 0.65 | 0.49 | 0.75 | 660.35 | 671.29 | 1.02 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 6,385 | 6,117 | 0.96 | 64,727 | 71,544 | 1.11 | 0.41 | 0.20 | 0.49 | 451.84 | 509.59 | 1.13 |
| Macau, China | 557 | 553 | 0.99 | 295 | 294 | 1.00 | 1.13 | 1.08 | 0.96 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 1.01 |
| Malaysia | 28,964 | 29,062 | 1.00 | 884 | 912 | 1.03 | 0.81 | 0.58 | 0.71 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 1.05 |
| Maldives | 325 | 406 | 1.25 | 32 | 41 | 1.28 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 1.00 | 1.56 | 1.50 | 0.96 |
| Mongolia | 2,679 | 2,786 | 1.04 | 12,547 | 13,174 | 1.05 | 0.64 | 0.49 | 0.76 | 98.35 | 101.97 | 1.04 |
| Myanmar | 60,380 | 49,663 | 0.82 | 45,128 | 43,900 | 0.97 | 0.34 | 0.12 | 0.35 | 43.02 | 50.03 | 1.16 |
| Nepal | 26,494 | 26,490 | 1.00 | 1,450 | 1,441 | 0.99 | 0.24 | 0.14 | 0.58 | 4.51 | 4.83 | 1.07 |
| Pakistan | 177,110 | 177,100 | 1.00 | 19,188 | 19,161 | 1.00 | 0.39 | 0.24 | 0.62 | 4.46 | 4.77 | 1.07 |
| Philippines | 94,185 | 94,185 | 1.00 | 9,706 | 9,708 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.33 | 0.66 | 3.27 | 3.46 | 1.06 |
| Singapore | 5,184 | 5,184 | 1.00 | 334 | 351 | 1.05 | 1.14 | 1.08 | 0.95 | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.99 |
| Sri Lanka | 20,869 | 20,195 | 0.97 | 6,543 | 7,219 | 1.10 | 0.63 | 0.46 | 0.72 | 7.08 | 7.51 | 1.06 |
| Taipei,China | 23,225 | 23,190 | 1.00 | 13,709 | 14,312 | 1.04 | 1.02 | 0.72 | 0.70 | 2.77 | 2.90 | 1.05 |
| Thailand | 67,597 | 66,214 | 0.98 | 11,121 | 11,307 | 1.02 | 0.67 | 0.48 | 0.73 | 2.26 | 2.37 | 1.05 |
| Viet Nam | 87,840 | 88,110 | 1.00 | 2,779,880 | 2,779,880 | 1.00 | 0.43 | 0.20 | 0.45 | 1,228.43 | 1,321.50 | 1.08 |

[^17]for productivity adjustment made by Inklaar (2019) and recommended that the methodology proposed by Inklaar (2019) be used uniformly at the regional level and for global linking. The Inklaar methodology introduces further refinements to the methodology used by the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in 2011. In particular, the Inklaar approach provides productivity adjustment factors that are transitive and base invariant. The second refinement concerns data: Inklaar's estimates are based on improved estimates of capital stock (in PPP terms) and economically meaningful labor shares. The ADB approach in the 2011 ICP cycle used only three levels for labor shares-0.5, 0.6 and $0.7-$ for three different groups of participating economies divided based on per capita real GDP. In contrast, Inklaar's approach provides properly estimated and calibrated labor shares for individual economies. Upon the recommendation of the Regional Advisory Board, the regional implementing agency (RIA) for Asia and the Pacific implemented the Inklaar method for productivity adjustments in the 2017 ICP cycle as well as for updating adjustment factors in the compilation of revised 2011 ICP results. For further details of the Inklaar methodology, see Appendix 1. The effect of this shift in methodology on productivity adjustment factors for 2011 is shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 shows significant revisions to productivity adjustment factors of 2011, expressed relative to Hong Kong, China. Productivity in most economies is lower under the Inklaar methodology (column 9) than in the estimates used by ADB in 2011 (column 8), with the exception of Maldives, where the change is negligible. For many economies, productivity estimates were revised significantly downward. These revisions imply higher price levels and lower real government expenditures. This downward revisions in real government expenditure in turn affected a downward revision in the real GDP for these economies. The refined methodology for productivity adjustment is used for 2011 revisions as well as for 2017, thus, ensuring consistency for comparison across the two benchmarks.

Revisions to purchasing power parities in 2011. The basic price data that underpins the computation and revision of PPPs for 2011 remain unchanged. Therefore, any revisions to 2011 PPPsstemfromchanges in national accounts data (which alters the weighting structure), adoption of refinements to productivity adjustment, and changes in the 2017 ICP (applied to 2011 as well) for some reference basic headings. From Table 5.1, it is clear that adopting Inklaar data and methodology has resulted in an upward adjustment in PPPs for the regional economies. Table 5.1 also presents the ratio of revised 2011 PPPs to the original PPPs at the GDP level (column 13). As expected, due to upward revisions in the PPPs for government final consumption expenditure (GFCE), revised PPPs for GDP are greater than the original PPPs for most of the economies, with the exception of Fiji, Maldives, and Singapore. Maldives was not affected by changes to productivity adjustment methodology. For Myanmar and the Lao People's Democratic Republic, under Inklaar methodology, PPPs were revised significantly upward, more than $10 \%$, and productivity was revised significantly downward. The PPPs for Maldives were revised downward, mainly because of GDP revisions in national accounts, because the productivity adjustment factor did not change significantly under the new approach.

## Consistency between the 2017 Cycle and Extrapolations from Revised 2011 Benchmark Comparisons

Given the considerable lags between successive benchmarks for the ICP-six years between the 2005, 2011, and 2017 cycles-users of PPPs tend to extrapolate PPPs from one ICP cycle until the results from the next cycle become available. Users, analysts, and international organizations who need PPPs on an annual basis are likely to extrapolate the 2011 results for the years between 2011 and 2017 and beyond,
using relevant indicators to update PPPs for different aggregates. For example, PPPs at the GDP level are likely to be extrapolated using GDP deflators, whereas PPPs for individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) are likely to be extrapolated using consumer price index (CPI) movements over time. This type of extrapolation is perfectly defensible and represents common practice.

When the new set of PPPs is released for a new benchmark year, the new PPPs and real expenditures can be compared with extrapolations from the previous benchmark. Users expect consistency between the extrapolated and the benchmark PPPs. At the release of 2005 results, analysts were surprised at the big systematic upward revisions of PPPs compared to extrapolations from benchmark. Similarly, there was considerable discussion when the 2011 benchmark PPPs represented a significant systematic downward shift in PPPs compared to extrapolations from 2005.

Divergence between benchmark and extrapolated PPPs is to be expected on several grounds especially when there is a long gap between two benchmarks. McCarthy (2013) offers several reasons for such divergence: differences in baskets of goods and services used for ICP and the deflators used in extrapolation; different index number methods and computational schemes; differences in weighting patterns; and differences in the changes in the structure of economies over time in comparison with the structure of reference economy. Also, as the economy becomes richer, the quality of goods and services priced in 2017 compared with the quality of well-known products in 2011 might be higher, leading to "quality creep" in comparison over time. Thus, for example, a wellknown brand specification for trousers is likely to have higher quality in 2017 compared with the quality of the same brand of trousers priced in 2011. In addition, major changes in the methodology used for the ICP are also likely to produce discernible differences in

PPPs. Inklaar and Rao (2017) demonstrated that once they accounted for differences in the methodology-by constructing a counterfactual for 2005 using 2005 data but 2011 methodology-no systematic differences were evident between the 2005 and 2011 benchmarks. The methodology, however, remained stable between the 2017 ICP cycle and the revised 2011 ICP.

The reliability of extrapolated PPPs hinges heavily on the quality of indicators used in the extrapolation process. Further, differences in the treatment of net exports in the ICP and in national accounts may also cause major divergence in the case of economies with large net exports, because the ICP uses exchange rates as the PPPs for net exports, whereas national accounts use deflators derived from export and import prices for deflating net exports. Thus, users should exercise caution when there is divergence between extrapolated and benchmark PPPs and real expenditures.

Are the results from the 2017 ICP cycle broadly consistent with extrapolations from 2011? Here comparisons between actual and extrapolated PPPs for 2011 are presented only for the GDP and ICEH for which GDP deflators and CPIs are respectively used for extrapolating 2011 revised PPPs to 2017.

Figure 5.1 shows that there are differences, sizable in some instances, between the actual and extrapolated PPPs for GDP, but there are no systematic patterns in these differences. In the low- to middle-income level, some economies have actual 2017 PPP estimates thatare higher than extrapolations from revised 2011; in other cases, the estimates are lower. For Hong Kong, China, by definition, there is no difference. The differences are small for Singapore and Taipei,China, possibly because of the reliability of their GDP deflators and high data quality in these economies. These various differences notwithstanding, there is no systematic pattern in the differences with ratios being scattered randomly above and below 1 .

Figure 5.1: Ratio of 2017 Purchasing Power Parities for Gross Domestic Product to Extrapolations from 2011 (Revised)


A similar conclusion emerges in the case of extrapolations of PPPs for ICEH presented in Figure 5.2. These figures again show no systematic patterns in the differences between the actual and extrapolated PPPs and real expenditures. While the differences are scattered randomly above and below 1 , low income economies show higher variability, possibly reflecting the reliability of the CPI or national accounts deflators used for extrapolations. Further,
in many low-income economies, the CPI focuses on capital cities or urban areas, whereas coverage for the ICP is economy-wide.

Overall, the PPPs for GDP and ICEH, the two key aggregates, estimated from the 2017 ICP cycle are broadly consistent with extrapolations from 2011, with no systematic patterns observed.

Figure 5.2: Ratio of 2017 Purchasing Power Parities to Extrapolations from 2011 (Revised) for Individual Consumption Expenditures by Households


## 6. Summary and Future Directions

The 2017 International Comparison Program (ICP) in Asia and the Pacific produced a wealth of information on the state of the economies in the region. Estimates of purchasing power parities of currencies, price levels, PPP-converted (real) gross domestic product and its components, combined with the results at a more detailed level provide ample information for researchers and government policy makers. This chapter summarizes key results and lessons learned and discusses future directions for the ICP in the region.

## Key Results and Conclusions

The 2017 ICP followed the same methodology as in 2011 albeit with minor refinements (see Chapter 5). All the results reported here use Hong Kong dollar as the reference currency and Hong Kong, China as the base economy. The total GDP, in real (or PPP) terms, for the 22 participating economies in 2017 ICP in Asia and the Pacific is HK\$232.34 trillion. Major contributors to the total size of the economy of the region are the People's Republic of China, India, and

Figure 6.1: Economy Shares of Real Gross Domestic Product and its Main Components, 2017 (\%)


[^18]Indonesia. These economies are also the three most populous economies in the region. In terms of size of real GDP, the economies in the region exhibit a large range. Figure 6.1 presents the percentage shares of the top 12 economies and others for total real GDP, individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH), actual individual consumption by households (AICH), government final consumption expenditure (GFCE), and gross fixed capital formation (GFCF). The People's Republic of China is the largest economy, with $50.76 \%$ share in the regional real GDP, with India ranking second at $20.83 \%$ and Indonesia third at $7.49 \%$. The top 12 economies account for nearly $98.0 \%$, while the other 10 have a combined share of about $2.0 \%$ of real GDP in the region. The rankings of the top and bottom economies remain the same whether the size
of the economy is measured in real or nominal terms. A similar picture and rankings emerge for the components of GDP namely, AICH, ICEH, GFCE, and GFCF, with the People's Republic of China, India, and Indonesia, in that order, dominating the real expenditures. Hong Kong, China and Singapore are ranked sixth and seventh largest when GDP is measured in nominal terms but slip down to 12 th and 11th respectively when GDP is measured in real terms.

Figure 6.2 shows per capita real GDP which exhibits significant diversity among the participating economies. The per capita real income of Singapore, which is highest in the region, is more than 32 times that of Nepal, which has the lowest per capita real GDP. The three largest economies in terms of overall

Figure 6.2: Per Capita Real Gross Domestic Product and its Main Components, 2017 (Hong Kong, China as base)


[^19]GDP also have large populations, resulting in lower ranks in terms of their per capita real GDP: the People's Republic of China is 8th, Indonesia is 13th, and India is 17 th among the 22 economies. Singapore has the highest per capita real GDP at HK $\$ 564,960$, followed by Brunei Darussalam (HK\$362,379); Hong Kong, China (HK\$360,247); and Taipei,China (HK\$283,878). At the other end of the spectrum, the economies with the lowest per capita real GDP are Nepal (HK\$17,431), Cambodia (HK\$23,853), Bangladesh (HK\$26,401), and Myanmar (HK\$26,519). While Singapore has a per capita real GDP that is 1.5 times that of Hong Kong, China, the per capita AICH for Hong Kong, China is 1.3 times that of Singapore, indicating higher consumption for households in

Hong Kong, China. Singapore, on the other hand, has much higher per capita expenditures on GFCF, almost twice that of Hong Kong, China.

The price level indexes (PLI) in Figure 6.3 exhibit several patterns depending on the aggregate under consideration. First, the price level for Hong Kong, China is always the highest among the 22 participating economies for all the aggregates; this implies that PPPs for all the aggregates of the other 21 economies are less than their respective exchange rates. Second, the PLIs for GDP and ICEH tend to be quite similar-this reflects the fact that ICEH is a major component of GDP. ${ }^{15}$ The PLI for government expenditure for almost all the economies is lower than

Figure 6.3: Price Level Indexes for Gross Domestic Product and Its Main Components, 2017
(Hong Kong, China = 100)


GDP = gross domestic product, GFCE = government final consumption expenditure, GFCF = gross fixed capital formation, ICEH = individual consumption expenditure by households, Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, NPISH = nonprofit institutions serving households, PRC= People's Republic of China. Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^20]the PLI for GDP, which reflects significant differences in wages and salaries for government compensation and low salaries in low-income economies. Third, the PLI for GFCF is above the PLI for GDP and ICEH for all the economies except for Hong Kong, China; Maldives; and Singapore. Price levels for machinery and equipment are likely to be close to one because most products priced under machinery and equipment are internationally traded. The People's Republic of China has consistently high PLIs relative to what may be expected for a middle-income economy.

The availability of results from the 2011 (revised) and the 2017 cycles-both calculated using the same methods-makes it possible to check consistency of the 2017 actual results with extrapolations from the 2011 benchmark (revised) results. While divergence between benchmark and extrapolated PPPs is expected for several reasons, the general finding is that the 2017 results are broadly consistent and observed differences between actual and extrapolated PPPs are random and do not exhibit any systematic pattern.

The reader is advised to refer to the main report for 2017 ICP in Asia and the Pacific for further details on the conceptual framework and governance of the ICP; item selection and price surveys; data validation procedures; special methods used in dealing with comparison resistant services such as dwellings, and government compensation; index number methods used in aggregating price data collected; and procedures for linking Asia and the Pacific with the rest of the world.

## Lessons from 2017

## At the Regional Level

Regional workshops. Through bilateral consultations with economies and through the regional workshops, ADB strengthened (i) statistical capacity in conducting ICP price surveys, (ii) rigorous data validation that
improved the quality of data for PPP estimation, and (iii) knowledge on estimating GDP expenditures for the required 155 basic heading weights at the economy level.

One of the major achievements in ICP implementation is the camaraderie and friendship built through personal interaction during the regional meetings, which was crucial in collectively achieving the milestones of this large and intensive statistical undertaking and fostered a culture of learning from each other's experiences.

## Rigorous data mining with the cooperation of the national implementing agencies. At the regional level,

 ADB noted that rigorous data mining from (i) existing censuses and surveys and (ii) administrative data allowed implementing agencies to collect complete and high quality data on indicators of quantity and quality for dwelling surveys. Thus, ADB encouraged the economies to search for all possible sources of data from various housing censuses and surveys, such as the Demographic and Health Survey, Household Socio Economic Survey, Living Standards and Measurement Survey, Living Standards Survey, Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, National Family Health Survey, National Sample Survey, and Social Indicator Sample Survey. At the same time, ADB rigorously validated the housing rental survey data to create good quality and comparable rental prices for the list of dwellings. These high-quality datasets led to successful research that developed an improved methodology for comparison of dwelling services in the region. With the positive recommendations from the Technical Advisory Group and Regional Advisory Board, the new methodology will be implemented in the 2020 ICP cycle and will replace the reference volume approach currently used.Not all participating economies used the Classification of Individual Consumption According to Purpose. In Asia and the Pacific, price survey operations for household products started in April 2017 in 14 economies and during May-July 2017 in
the remaining eight participating economies. Because the prices collected did not represent the prices for calendar year 2017, average item prices for the 12-month collection period were converted to 2017 annual average prices for PPP computation using monthly basic heading-level (or the closest aggregate available) consumer price indexes (CPIs).

Toward this end, ADB developed an approach for adjusting the prices to the 2017 calendar year, using monthly price indexes from the CPI to meet the PPP computation requirements for 2017 calendar year average prices. This exercise revealed that many economies still have not adopted the Classification of Individual Consumption According to Purpose. More standardization of CPIs is needed when economies undertake any CPI revisions in future. Similar issues exist in the GDP expenditures on housing services, where estimation methods need to be improved and data gaps must be addressed.

Guiding principles in 2017 and previous cycles. As in the 2005 and 2011 rounds, the guiding principles in implementing the 2017 ICP have been transparency, ownership, and bottom-up approach. These principles are fundamental to the success of the ICP in Asia and the Pacific.

## At the Economy Level

Best practices applied to consumer price index methods. The ICP helped build capacity in economies that are now adopting best practices from ICP to improve their CPI whenever there is a base year revision exercise. Maldives is already integrating the use of structured product descriptions in revising CPI product baskets, while Thailand has indicated it will use structured product descriptions for CPI price collection. Bangladesh plans to include those ICP items (along with structured product descriptions) that are important to them in their CPI price
collection. Further, ICP data validation procedures are also being applied in the CPI price validation. These help in fostering greater synergy between CPI and ICP operations, while also improving CPIs.

The inclusion of ICP items in the CPI item list or use of CPI prices for matching ICP products greatly facilitated ICP price collection in some economies and led to a greater integration of ICP and CPI activities.

## Continued participation over several cycles among

 national teams. ICP teams from the participating economies have continued to participate in several ICP rounds, leading to more efficient ICP operations at the economy level. The experience that these teams gained in implementing the ICP at regular intervals maintained the momentum in ICP implementation at the economy level. The shorter 3-year cycle introduced since the 2017 ICP cycle will help strengthen institutional and technical capacity and enable the implementing agencies in the economies to carry out the 2020 ICP and future rounds.
## Machinery and equipment and construction

 price surveys. Local experts provided highly valuable assistance in collecting prices for machinery, equipment, and construction in some economies. Meanwhile, some specified models of machinery and equipment items were difficult to find, especially in smaller economies, and in some cases more popular and up-to-date models for electronic products were available for pricing. Because the ICP requires pricing of exact matches in equipment for price comparison, for future ICP rounds it is desirable to consider a wider range of comparable models for equipment items. The guidance and recommendations of the international experts on price validations and specifications of construction and machinery and equipment items helped the economies substantially improve quality of their data.
## Future Directions

As the 2017 ICP cycle in Asia and the Pacific is drawing to a conclusion, ADB in its role as the regional implementing agency (RIA) is placing administrative structures to conduct the 2020 ICP cycle in the region. Timing of the 2020 cycle was largely determined by the United Nations Statistical Commission (UNSC), which has recommended that frequency of the ICP be increased and mandated 2020 as the next benchmark year. Funding to proceed with the 2020 cycle has been secured and ADB has initiated various activities. ADB has recently held the inception workshop for the 2020 ICP, where the

Framework of Partnership between ADB and the national implementing agencies for participation in ICP was discussed. Work on the product lists has begun with household product list already finalized and price surveys for household initiated.

The UNSC has endorsed and strongly encouraged participating economies to introduce the rolling price survey approach, which is designed to evenly distribute the burden of price surveys over a period of 3 years. The ICP Global Office has commissioned a task force to prepare a report on the feasibility of implementing the rolling price survey approach in different regions in near future.

## Appendixes

## Appendix 1: Methodology for the 2017 Cycle in Asia and the Pacific

This appendix introduces the methodology and framework that underpins the International Comparison Program (ICP). The 2017 ICP final report for the region will include a more detailed presentation of the methodology. The following section describes the index number foundations for the ICP and international comparisons of national accounts aggregates. Section A1.1 establishes a link between (i) the national accounts practice of compiling gross domestic product (GDP) at current and constant prices for comparisons over time and (ii) the notion of purchasing power parities (PPPs) and real expenditures for spatial comparisons across economies. Section A1.2 discusses the hierarchical structure used to implement the ICP; section A1.3 describes the index number methods used to aggregate item level price data, leading to estimates of PPPs for aggregates at various levels. Section A1.4 focuses on more practical aspects of the ICP including preparing item lists; the survey framework for price collection; and the subsequent data validation and editing. Section A1.5 describes the refinements in the methodology for productivity adjustments for comparisons of government compensation; and finally, section A1.6 sketches the linking approach that the ICP Global Office uses to combine results from all the participating regions leading to estimates of PPPs and real expenditures at the global level. The global comparisons are presented with United States as the base economy and US dollar as the reference currency.

## A1.1 Index Number Foundations for International Comparisons

Index number theory for price and quantity comparisons over time provides the foundation for the ICP framework and methodology for compiling PPPs.

In particular, the fundamental notion of decomposing changes in value into price change and quantity change is critical in building the conceptual framework for the ICP. In the System of National Accounts, the chapter on Price and Volume Measures states: "The index numbers of interest within the SNA [System of National Accounts] are designed to decompose changes in value aggregates into their overall change in price and volume components" (United Nations 2009, p. 297). The national statistical agencies use this framework in their decomposition of changes in GDP over two periods, $s$ and $t$ :

$$
\text { Change in GDP from period } \begin{aligned}
s \text { to } t & =\frac{G D P_{t}}{G D P_{s}} \\
& =P_{s t} \times Q_{s t}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $P_{s t}$ represents price change and $Q_{s t}$ represents quantity (or volume) change component. In national accounts parlance, $P_{s t}$ is the GDP deflator for period $t$ with base period $s$; the quantity index, $Q_{s t}$, is the volume index for period $t$ with base period $s$. From this equation, the volume measure can be obtained from an observed change in GDP and a suitably measured GDP deflator $P_{s t}$, that is:

Volume change from period $s$ to $t=Q_{s t}$

$$
=\frac{\frac{G D P_{t}}{G D P_{s}}}{P_{s t}}
$$

This volume change measure can be expressed, equivalently, as:

Volume change from period $s$ to $t=Q_{s t}=\frac{\frac{G D P_{t}}{P_{s t}}}{G D P_{s}}$

$$
=\frac{\text { GDP in period } t \text { at constant period } s \text { prices }}{\text { GDP in period } s \text { in period } s \text { prices }}
$$

Here, GDP at constant prices, on the right-hand side of the equation, is obtained by deflating the observed GDP in a period with the corresponding GDP deflator.

The framework for international comparisons is analogous to the temporal decomposition described above. Now consider GDP in economies $j$ and $k$, denoted by $G D P_{j}$ and $G D P_{k}$, observed at a given period of time, for example the year 2017 for the current ICP cycle. Usually, these two GDPs would be expressed in respective domestic currencies. The index number decomposition of relative levels of GDP, the ratio of GDPs, can be expressed as the ratio of real GDP in each economy converted using an appropriate measure of price level differences across the two economies. In order to distinguish between temporal and international comparisons, let $P P P_{j k}$ represent the level of prices in economy $k$ relative to prices in economy $j$ while accounting for the currency units in which GDP's are expressed. Thus, the fundamental index decomposition gives:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Relative levels of GDP } & =\frac{G D P_{k}}{G D P_{j}} \\
& =P P P_{j k} \times Q_{j k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, the volume comparison between economies $j$ and $k$ is given by:

$$
Q_{j k}=\frac{\frac{G D P_{k}}{G D P_{j}}}{P P P_{j k}}=\frac{G D P_{k}}{\frac{G P P_{j k}}{G D P_{j}}}=\frac{\frac{G D P_{k}}{P P P_{j k}}}{\frac{G D P_{j}}{P P P_{j j}}}
$$

where $\frac{G D P_{k}}{P P P_{j k}}$ is a measure of real GDP or volume of economy $k$, expressed in currency units of economy $j$ after accounting for differences in levels of prices in these two economies. Similarly, if $P P P_{j j}=1$, $G D P_{j}$ presents the volume or real GDP of economy $j$ in currency units of economy $j$. Here $j$ is base or reference economy.

Thus, volume comparisons of GDP and other aggregates across participating economies require estimates of PPPs for the currencies of all the economies, $\left\{\mathrm{PPP}_{j}\right.$ : $j=1,2, \ldots, 22\}$, all expressed relative to a reference or base economy currency. For the ICP in Asia and the Pacific, Hong Kong, China is the base economy and the

Hong Kong dollar is the reference currency. The following subsections discuss the steps involved in compiling PPPs for ICP in the Asia and Pacific region.

## A1.2 Hierarchical Approach to Compilation of Purchasing Power Parities

The ICP uses a bottom-up approach to aggregate price data collected for individual items, moving progressively to higher-level aggregates, ultimately leading to estimates of PPPs at the GDP level. The approach is essentially the same whether price comparisons are regional or global. ${ }^{1}$ Details of this hierarchical approach are outlined in World Bank (2013) and Rao (2013). Figure A1.1 depicts the pyramid structure for the aggregation of price data.

Figure A1.1: Pyramid Structure for the Aggregation of Price Data


GDP = gross domestic product, ICP = International Comparison Program. Source: Rao, D.S. Prasada. 2013. "The Framework of the International Comparison Program." In Measuring the Real Size of the World Economy, edited by World Bank. Washington, DC: World Bank.

At the base of this structure lies the most important input into PPP computation, the national annual average prices for a large number of items (goods and services) provided by the participating economies. The next section discusses the processes involved in identifying and preparing the list of products to be priced by the participating economies.

[^21]
## Basic Headings

In the first stage of aggregating price data, individual items at the base of the pyramid are grouped into 155 groups of homogeneous goods and services referred to as the basic headings. These basic headings have three important features. First, products within a basic heading should be homogeneous, each covering a group of similar well-defined goods or services. For example, in the ICP in Asia and the Pacific, the basic heading of rice includes 20 different items of rice consumed across the participating economies. Second, the relative prices of goods or services within a basic heading are expected to be similar across economies. Third, basic headings are the lowest level of aggregation of items in the GDP breakdown at which expenditures
and expenditure shares are available. This feature of the basic headings is similar to the elementary groups of items used to compute elementary indexes in the process of consumer price index (CPI) compilation.

## Higher Level Aggregates

Once the basic headings are identified, then these are aggregated to form 126 classes. For example, the bread and cereals class comprises the basic headings of rice; other cereals, flour, and other cereal products; bread; other bakery products; and pasta products and couscous.

At the next level, these 126 classes are clustered into 63 groups. For example, the food group comprises the

Table A1.1 Composition of Classes, Groups, Categories, and Main Aggregates, 2017 Cycle in Asia and the Pacific

| Main Aggregates and Categories |  | Category | Group | Class | Basic Heading |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Domestic Product |  | 28 | 63 | 126 | 155 |
| 1100000 | Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households | 13 | 44 | 91 | 110 |
| 1101000 | Food and non-alcoholic beverages |  | 2 | 11 | 29 |
| 1102000 | Alcoholic beverages, tobacco and narcotics |  | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 1103000 | Clothing and footwear |  | 2 | 5 | 5 |
| 1104000 | Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels |  | 5 | 8 | 8 |
| 1105000 | Furnishings, household equipment and routine household maintenance |  | 6 | 12 | 13 |
| 1106000 | Health |  | 3 | 7 | 7 |
| 1107000 | Transport |  | 3 | 13 | 13 |
| 1108000 | Communication |  | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 1109000 | Recreation and culture |  | 6 | 13 | 13 |
| 1110000 | Education |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1111000 | Restaurants and hotels |  | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 1112000 | Miscellaneous goods and services |  | 7 | 10 | 10 |
| 1113000 | Net purchases abroad |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1200000 | Individual Consumption Expenditure by NPISHs | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 1201000 | Housing |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1202000 | Health |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1203000 | Recreation and culture |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1204000 | Education |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1205000 | Social protection and other services |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1300000 | Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government | 5 | 7 | 16 | 21 |
| 1301000 | Housing |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1302000 | Health |  | 2 | 7 | 12 |
| 1303000 | Recreation and culture |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1304000 | Education |  | 2 | 6 | 6 |
| 1305000 | Social protection |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1400000 | Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 1500000 | Gross Capital Formation | 3 | 5 | 8 | 12 |
| 1501000 | Gross fixed capital formation |  | 3 | 6 | 10 |
| 1502000 | Changes in inventories |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1503000 | Acquisitions less disposals of valuables |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1600000 | Balance of Exports and Imports | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

[^22]classes of bread and cereals; meat; fish and seafood; milk, cheese, and eggs; oils and fats; fruits; vegetables; sugar, jam, honey, chocolate, and confectionery; and food products not elsewhere classified.

The 63 groups are then grouped into 28 categories. For example, the category of food and non-alcoholic beverages comprises the groups (i) food and (ii) nonalcoholic beverages.

At the next level, the 28 categories are grouped into six main aggregates which together make up the GDP. Table A1.1 shows the composition of the six main aggregates under GDP which are critically important to users and policy makers.

## Expenditure Weights

In order to compute PPPs for classes and corresponding real expenditure aggregates, first prices of individual goods and services belonging to the basic headings within that class are aggregated leading to PPPs at the basic heading level (see Section A1.3 for a description of the method used for this purpose). Then, these basic heading PPPs are aggregated upward using expenditure share weights associated with corresponding basic headings. Weights at the basic heading level are computed using final expenditures for each basic heading from national accounts data made available by the implementing agencies of the participating economies. For example, for computing PPPs for the "bread and cereals" class, it is necessary to have (i) PPPs for the five basic headings that make up this class; and (ii) basic heading level expenditures from national accounts.

## A1.3 Index Number Methods for Computing Purchasing Power Parities of Currencies

## Properties of Index Number Formulas for International Comparisons

Many index number formulas are available for making price comparisons. Some of the well-known formulas
include Jevons; Dutot; Laspeyres, Paasche, Fisher; Tornqvist; Lowe; and the geometric Young index. Only formulas which satisfy several important criteria can be used for the purpose of international comparisons. Of these several properties, three most important are: transitivity, economy symmetry or economy base invariance, and characteristicity.

Transitivity. Transitivity is an internal consistency requirement that states that PPPs computed using a given index number formula must satisfy the following equation for any three economies, for example $j, k$, and $l$ :

$$
P P P_{j k}=P P P_{j l} \cdot P P P_{l k} \text { for all } j, k, l=1,2, \ldots, 22
$$

This property requires that a PPP for economy $k$ with reference economy $j$ must be identical to a PPP computed indirectly through link economy l. For example, if three economies of interest are: Hong Kong, China; India; and Malaysia, then transitivity implies that:

$$
P P P_{\mathrm{HKG}, \text { India }}=P P P_{\mathrm{HKG}, \text { Malaysia }} \cdot P P P_{\text {Malaysia,India }}
$$

To compute PPPs, the ICP uses only index number formulas that satisfy this property. With transitivity satisfied, it is sufficient to publish PPPs with one selected economy as the base or reference economy, thus the ICP publishes only PPPs with Hong Kong, China as the reference. All other PPPs can be computed using PPPs with Hong Kong, China as the base. Continuing from the example above, the PPP for India with Malaysia as base can be computed as:

$$
P P P_{\text {Malaysia,India }}=\frac{P P P_{\text {HKG,India }}}{P P P_{\text {HKG,Malysia }}}
$$

Exchange rates also satisfy transitivity, implying absence of any possibility for arbitrage-the activity of buying and selling a currency for pure profit arising from the differences in exchange rates for the same currency.

Economy symmetry or base economy invariance. For international comparisons, it is important that all the participating economies are treated symmetrically, without giving a special place or significance to any one of the economies. Economy symmetry is satisfied if the relativities in PPPs between any two economies are not affected by either the choice of reference economy or currency.

Characteristicity. The property of transitivity necessarily implies that a PPP between two economies, say India and Malaysia, would be influenced by price and expenditure data from all the remaining 20 economies. Therefore, a bilateral comparison between these two economies (when transitivity is not required) will differ from a bilateral comparison when transitivity is imposed. The property of characteristicity advocates that PPPs satisfying transitivity in multilateral comparisons must be as close as possible to direct bilateral comparisons between pairs of economies. The Gini-Eltetö-Köves-Szulc (GEKS) method is specially formulated to maintain a high degree of characteristicity in a multilateral context.

Following the hierarchical scheme outlined above, PPPs can, in principle, be compiled at three different levels: (i) the item level; (ii) the basic heading level; and (3) at all levels of aggregation above the basic heading level. Different index number methods are used for price comparisons at different levels of aggregation, reflecting the nature of data available at each level.

## Item Level Price Comparisons

At the item level there is no index number problem. The PPP for the currency of a given economy with currency of a reference economy based on a single item is simply the ratio of prices of the item observed in the two economies. The Big Mac index discussed in the main text of this report is a good example of an item level comparison.

The ICP does not publish item level PPPs because such PPPs cannot be defined unless the product is priced in both economies. For example, the Big Mac is not available in Cambodia, hence it is not meaningful to have a PPP for the Big Mac for Cambodia with Hong Kong, China as the reference economy.

## Basic Heading Level Price Comparisons: The Country-Product-Dummy Method

In calculating PPPs for each basic heading, the only data available are the prices of items included in the basic heading. It is almost impossible to collect data on expenditures or quantities consumed in the whole economy at the item-level. Also, not all items in the basic heading are priced in all economies. Economies usually price only a subset of items in a basic heading, generally those items which are representative of expenditures for that basic heading.

The ICP uses the country-product-dummy (CPD) method-recommended by the Technical Advisory Group since the 2005 cycle-for aggregating itemlevel price data to compute PPPs at the basic heading level. Details of the method along with a comparison of its properties with other methods are in Rao (2013). The method regresses the logarithm of observed prices on country-specific and product-specific dummy variables, hence the label country-productdummy method.

Consider a basic heading which has $N$ items. For example, the basic heading of rice contains 20 items, $N=20$. Let $p_{i j}$ be the observed or reported price of commodity $i$ in $j$-th economy $\{i=1,2, \ldots, N ; j=1,2, \ldots, 22\}$. Conceptually, every $p_{i j}$ may be decomposed into an commodity-specific factor, $\eta_{i}$; an economy-specific factor, $\pi_{j}$; and a factor of $\varepsilon_{i j}$ to account for the deviation of $\eta_{i} \times \pi_{j}$ from the actual price $p_{i j}$ :

$$
p_{i j}=\pi_{j} \times \eta_{i} \times \varepsilon_{i j}
$$

Taking the natural logarithm of both sides and invoking the property of logarithm, we have:

$$
\ln p_{i j}=\ln \pi_{j}+\ln \eta_{i}+\ln \varepsilon_{i j}
$$

Because $\ln \pi_{j}$ is economy-specific and $\ln \eta_{i}$ is productspecific, they can be estimated by the CPD method using the following regression model with economy and product fixed effects using dummy variables:

$$
\ln p_{i j}=\sum_{k=1}^{22} \pi_{k} D_{k}+\sum_{n=1}^{N} \eta_{n} D_{n}^{*}+u_{i j}
$$

where $p_{i j}$ is the price of the $i$-th item reported by economy $j . D_{k}$ is the country or economy dummy variable such that $D_{k}=1$ if $k=j$ and $D_{k}=0$ if $k \neq j$; and $D_{i}$ is the commodity dummy variable such that $D_{n}^{*}=1$ if $n=$ i ; and $D_{n}^{*}=0$ if $n \neq i$. The last, $u_{i j}$, is a random disturbance. The goal is to estimate $\ln p_{j}$ with the estimator $\hat{\pi}_{k}, \ln p_{i}$, with the estimator $\hat{\eta}_{n}$, and $\ln \varepsilon_{i j}$ with the estimator $\hat{u}_{i j}$.

The CPD method estimates this regression model using price data for the basic headings by ordinary least squares after imposing one parameter restriction. ${ }^{2}$ Since Hong Kong, China is the base economy, this model is estimated after imposing the restriction that $\pi_{H K G}=0$. Any standard statistical package such as Stata can be used to implement the estimation of this model. Let the estimated values of the parameters be denoted by $\left\{\hat{\pi}_{k}: \mathrm{k}=1,2, \ldots ., 22\right\}$ and $\left\{\hat{\eta}_{n}: n=1,2, \ldots, N\right\}$. Then a $P P P_{H K G, j}$ for economy $j$ with Hong Kong, China as the base is given by:

$$
P P P_{H K G, j}=\exp \left(\hat{\pi}_{j}\right) j=1,2, \ldots ., 22
$$

Note that the PPP for Hong Kong, China is equal to 1 since $\exp \left(\hat{\pi}_{H K G}\right)=\exp (0)=1$.

The CPD method is fairly simple but has many useful properties:

1. If all the items are priced in all the economies, then the PPP formula simply reduces to the

Jevons index used as the elementary index in CPI computations. The PPP is given by the unweighted geometric average of the price ratios:

$$
P P P_{H K G, j}=\prod_{\mathrm{n}=1}^{N}\left[\frac{p_{i j}}{p_{i, H K}}\right]^{1 / N}
$$

2. The method can be applied in the practical scenario where not all commodities are priced in all the economies, provided there is connectivity in the observed price matrix. ${ }^{3}$
3. With the CPD method, it is possible to attach weights to individual price observations. In the CPD method described here, all the items have the same weight equal to 1 . Note that not all the items priced by an economy in the basic heading would be representative or equally important in the basic heading expenditure of the economy. If the national implementing agencies can meaningfully identify products which are important, such products may be given a higher weight. The issue of whether to attach weights and, if so, what weights should be selected, were discussed at several meetings of the Technical Advisory Group during the 2011 ICP cycle. After serious deliberations, the group finally recommended assigning a weight of 3 to products labeled as important and a weight of 1 to the remaining products.
4. Identifying important products is not straightforward and is subject to interpretation by the national implementing agencies. Uncertainty regarding what constitutes the importance of an item may create unnecessary bias when this information is used in giving weights to products in the CPD method. The 2017 ICP in Asia and the Pacific, similar to the 2005 and 2011 ICP, opted not to use weights for products priced. Notwithstanding, the regional implementing agency (RIA) collects this information for the global core products and submits it to the ICP Global Office for use in global linking.

[^23]5. Finally, residuals of the estimated CPD models form the basis for Dikhanov tables, which are used in identifying outliers and data validation.

## Reference Purchasing Power Parities for Some Basic Headings

Out of the 155 basic headings used in the ICP, there are some basic headings for which it is difficult to (i) specify the products and (ii) collect product prices that can be used in the CPD model. In such instances, PPPs of other basic headings which are considered similar are used as proxies or reference PPPs. For example, PPPs for the basic heading "maintenance and repair of dwelling" serve as a reference PPP for repair of household appliances. A full list of reference PPPs is in Appendix 7.

## Computing Purchasing Power Parities for Higher Level Aggregates: The Gini-Èltetö-Köves-Szulc Method

After computing PPPs for the 155 basic headings, the RIA compiles a complete table of PPPs for 155 basic headings for the 22 participating economies, along with expenditure or expenditure share data from national accounts corresponding to each basic heading for all the economies. ${ }^{4}$ The basic heading PPPs are treated like price data associated with the composite group of items which the basic heading represents. To implement the index number formulas below, the following data structure is available:

$$
\left\{p_{i j}, e_{i j}: \mathrm{i}=1,2, \ldots, 155 ; \text { and } j=1,2, \ldots, 22\right\}
$$

where $p_{i j}$ and $e_{i j}$ are, respectively, price (PPP) and expenditure (in local currency units) for $i$-th basic heading in $j$-th economy.

To compute PPPs at higher levels of aggregation, it is necessary to identify the aggregate of interest first and then consider all the basic headings that make up this
aggregate. If the aggregate "food and non-alcoholic beverages" is of interest, then it is necessary to include all the 29 basic headings that comprise this aggregate. Similarly, if GDP is of interest, then all the 155 basic headings are included. The formulas given below are for the whole GDP, but the same formula applied to different sub-classes of basic headings can be used for other aggregates.

Since the 2005 ICP cycle, the Technical Advisory Group has recommended using the GEKS method as the index number method to compute PPPs for higher level aggregates above the basic heading. The GEKS method builds on the well-known Fisher binary index number formula, chosen because it satisfies a number of axiomatic and economic theoretic properties, including the country reversal test, factor reversal test, and commensurability test. The Fisher index is also known to be superlative from an economic theoretic viewpoint (Diewert 2013).

The GEKS PPPs are computed in two stages. In the first stage, the Fisher binary index, denoted by $F_{j k}$, is computed for each pair of economies as the geometric mean of the Laspeyres and Paasche price indexes denoted, respectively, $L_{j k}$ and $P_{j k}$. Therefore

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Fisher index }=F_{j k}=\left[L_{j k} \cdot P_{j k}\right]^{1 / 2} \\
=\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{155} \frac{p_{i k}}{p_{i j}} \cdot e_{i j}\right) \times \frac{1}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{15 p_{i j}} \cdot e_{i k}\right)}\right]^{1 / 2}
\end{gathered}
$$

where $e_{i j}=\frac{p_{i j} \cdot q_{i j}}{\sum_{i=1}^{s \leq 5} p_{i j} \cdot q_{i j}}$ is the national accounts' expenditure share of $i$-th basic heading in $j$-th economy.

This Fisher index is not transitive and therefore cannot be used for international comparisons. The GEKS formula for computing PPP for economy $k$ with economy $j$ as the base is:

$$
P P P_{j k}=\prod_{l=1}^{22}\left[F_{j l} F_{l k}\right]^{1 / 22} \quad j, k=1,2, \ldots, 22
$$

[^24]The GEKS index provides PPPs that are transitive and base invariant and at the same time, by construction, close to the Fisher binary index. Therefore, the GEKS index also possesses the property of characteristicity. It is due to these desirable properties that this index has been the main aggregation procedure used in Eurostat and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) comparisons since 1990. During the 2005 ICP cycle, the technical advisory group considered a number of alternative methods and recommended the use of the GEKS procedure.

## Non-Additivity of Sub-Aggregates in Real Terms

From the national accounts, it is clear that all the sub-aggregates expressed in local currency units add up to higher level aggregates. For example, the sum of the values of the six main aggregates add up to GDP: this is known as the additivity property. When these aggregates are converted using exchange rates, the resulting nominal aggregates are also additive: for example, nominal values of the six main aggregates also sum to nominal GDP. This is because the exchange rate used to convert each component is same across all aggregates. However, the additivity property does not hold for real aggregates obtained by converting aggregates in local currency units into a common currency unit using PPPs. This is because each aggregate has its own corresponding PPP which is different across aggregates. For example, nominal individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) is converted into real expenditures by using a PPP specific for household consumption, which is estimated using data on PPPs and expenditures for 110 basic headings. The gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) is converted using 10 PPPs and corresponding expenditures of headings. However, GDP is converted using PPP which is calculated by aggregating PPPs and expenditures data for all the 155 basic headings. Users of real or volume comparisons from the ICP must be aware of lack of additivity when PPPs are used in deriving real expenditures and, therefore, refrain from using the real aggregates to study the structure of GDP or computing shares of each real aggregate in real GDP.

## A1.4 Product Lists, Survey Framework, and Data Validation and Editing

The most critical and resource intensive activities within the ICP are: determining the lists of items, goods, and services to be priced; establishing the principles and survey framework for price surveys; collecting actual prices; and, finally, validating and editing price data. Once price data are finalized, they are combined with national accounts expenditure data in the compilation of PPPs.

## Preparation of Product Lists

Since 2005, the ICP has adopted a regional approach where each region is responsible for implementing ICP in the economies in their respective regions. The ICP Global Office at the World Bank is responsible for linking regional results and compiling the global results. The 2017 ICP uses the linking methodology established during the 2011 ICP cycle, discussed in Section A1.6. The linking methodology uses prices collected by all the 176 participating economies for a common list of products, referred to as the global core list, that was developed by the ICP Global Office.

The ICP therefore relies on regionally determined product lists and the global list of products. These lists are determined after an extensive process of consultation between all the stakeholders. At the regional level, the RIA prepared the 2017 lists, starting from the 2011 ICP product lists and updated global products lists from the World Bank. Extensive consultations with coordinators from the participating economies, who considered their CPI lists and other relevant product lists, provided valuable suggestions regarding inclusion, exclusion, and the structured product descriptions of the items. The RIA facilitated and moderated in the preparation of the lists. At the global level, the ICP Global Office consulted with all the regional coordinators through its Inter-Agency Coordination Group meetings in its preparation of the global core lists. Both the regional and global lists are prepared in accordance with a set of common principles:

- Consistency with national accounts practices. Because the ultimate purpose for compiling PPPs is to convert expenditure aggregates in national accounts to facilitate volume or real expenditure comparisons, it is necessary to examine the coverage of the particular aggregate in the national accounts and then identify product lists for ICP price surveys. For example, if national accounts use the rental approach to derive the aggregate for dwelling services, then for ICP price surveys, the ICP needs to consider rental prices for dwellings typical in the participating economies.
- Comparability. Comparability of products priced is an essential requirement for meaningful price comparisons across economies. The general principle of comparing like with like underpins the ICP price comparisons. Consequently, specification of the products is an important task undertaken at the time of preparation of product lists. Comparability is achieved through the use of structured product descriptions (SPDs).
- Representativity. The items included in the product list must be representative of the products that are purchased in an economy and are included in the national accounts aggregate under consideration. Comparability and representativity are two competing requirements that need to be balanced when preparing item lists. For example, a branded men's shirt with specifications such as $100 \%$ cotton and full sleeves would be perfectly comparable across all the economies. However, such a specified branded shirt may not be representative of the shirts purchased in many of the participating economies. The Big Mac is another item that is comparable but may not be representative of household consumption in all economies where it is available. The task of compiling a list of representative products is particularly challenging in a diverse region like Asia and the Pacific. Consequently, the ICP took an inclusive approach that includes products representative of various subregions and encourages participating economies to price as many available and representative items
as possible to ensure a sufficient degree of overlap of items between economies.
- Importance indicators. To address the issue of representativity of the product list, participating economies are encouraged to indicate whether or not a product priced in their economy is considered important, where importance is expected to be determined on the basis of its expenditure share within the basic heading. Importance indicator information can be incorporated into PPP computation by giving different weights for important and less important products.
- Structured product descriptions. SPDs are essentially a set of price-determining characteristics used to specify the products to be priced. Identifying SPDs for each of the items included in the product list is a major task, but SPDs provide a way of achieving a fine balance between comparability and representativity. SPDs, for example, include details of the package size, the type of outlet, and whether the product is branded or unbranded. SPDs ensure that the quality of products priced are the same across the economies when the specifications in the SPDs are followed diligently. The ICP Global Office determines the SPDs of global product lists for household consumption, government compensation of employees, machinery and equipment, and construction, and these are used across all the participating regions with minor deviations that may be specific to each region.


## Product Lists for Major Aggregates

Household consumption. Household consumption is the most significant aggregate in the national accounts with an average share, over the 22 participating economies, of approximately $45 \%$ of GDP. It comprises 110 basic headings out of 155 basic headings for the GDP. The items in the product list for household consumption comprise (i) the regional product list with goods and services considered representative of consumption in the participating economies of the region and (ii) the global core list of products prepared
by the ICP Global Office. A degree of overlap between the regional and global lists is desirable. The regional list for Asia and the Pacific comprises 887 goods and services whereas the global list comprises 415 items; the two lists share 296 products in common. The combined list of regional and global items comprises in total 1006 items, which are then priced by the participating economies.

Health and education. These are two components of household consumption where one part of the expenditure is incurred by the individuals and another through government provision. Across the 22 participating economies in the region, there is a diverse mix of government provision and the degrees to which these services are subsidized. The basic principle is that prices used for converting health and education expenditures should reflect market prices, regardless of who provides these services and at what price. The product list for health includes 174 goods and services and the global core list has 77 items. Similar to the 2011 ICP, pharmaceutical products from the ICP Global Office were split according to the brands priced for originator products, and the origin for the generic products. This resulted in 133 child items in the regional list from 57 parent pharmaceutical items in the global list. Therefore, participating economies had a total of 174 goods and services to price under the health category. For education, the product list consists of seven items and coincides with the global core list.

Housing or dwelling expenditure. It is difficult to make international price and volume comparisons for dwellings. Differences in national accounts practices in the treatment of owner-occupied housing and the lack of well-established rental markets make the task particularly complex. At the conclusion of extensive data collection and analysis by the RIA in Asia and the Pacific and at the recommendation of the Regional Advisory Board and Technical Advisory Group, the ICP decided that in the 2017 cycle, it will continue to use the reference volume approach used in the 2005 and 2011 cycles. During 2017 ICP cycle, the participating economies conducted rental surveys for use in
implementing the rental approach. In parallel, data on a range of quantity measures of dwelling volumes and associated quality indicators were collected for use in the quantity approach. To implement the rental approach, rents were collected for 21 types of dwellings, of which 9 were houses ( 7 from global list and 2 specific to the Asia and Pacific region); 10 were apartments (5 global and 5 regional specifications); and 2 were traditional dwellings both with regional specifications. On the volume side, the standard volume indicators were used: number of dwellings per 100 people, number of rooms per 100 people, and square meters of usable floor space per person. In addition, quality indicators were used, measured by the proportion of dwellings with electricity, safe water, inside toilets, and several other quality indicators collected from United Nations sources on Sustainable Development Goals. The RIA developed a new approach that combined the rental and quantity approaches recommended for estimating PPPs for dwelling, and this approach will be implemented after further testing during the 2020 ICP.

Government compensation. The list of standard occupations used in the ICP for this aggregate is determined at the global level. There are a total of 35 occupations, of which 34 are from the global list; the occupation of "medical imaging and therapeutic equipment technicians" was added in Asia and the Pacific. However, after considering the problem of comparability of some occupations across economies of the region, the occupation of "senior government official" was dropped. The final list included 9 occupations from health, 5 occupations from education, and 20 occupations from collective services of the government.

Machinery and equipment. Machinery and equipment is a component of GFCF, along with construction. The list for machinery and equipment is global and includes 196 products, 93 of which are unspecified and 103 of which are specified with details of make, manufacturer, and technical specifications. After evaluating variability in prices reported, the RIA and NIA agreed to drop 16 out of 196 items
from the list for which the price data was evaluated as not comparable in consultation with an expert on machinery and equipment. Further analysis of price data for unspecified items, led to a decision to split 26 unspecified items into two groups following established criteria based on price clustering.

Construction. Construction consists of residential buildings, non-residential buildings, and civil engineering works. The input approach is used for construction in the region. For Asia and the Pacific, the region uses a regional list, which covers material inputs, equipment rental, and labor. The regional list is composed of 40 items for materials, 10 items for equipment rental, and 8 items for labor inputs. Out of 58 items, 55 items are from the global list and 3 are regional items. Indicators of relevance of material inputs in the different types of construction were used to identify the relevance of construction inputs for each type of construction. For example, only 30 material inputs out of 40 are considered relevant for residential buildings, 34 for non-residential buildings and 21 for civil engineering works.

## Survey Framework

The ICP Global Office designed the survey framework used in the price surveys conducted by the participating economies to meet the basic principles of the ICP. The RIA applied the global framework after undertaking modifications suitable for the region.

National coverage. Surveys collected prices that are representative of national averages by covering both rural and urban markets of the participating economies and did not concentrate only on urban areas or capital cities. However, for certain aggregates, the surveys necessarily focused on major cities. For dwellings, surveys focused on areas where rental markets are prevalent; for machinery and equipment, surveys were limited to capital cities.

Calendar year. The ICP requires that prices used in PPP computation must represent annual average
prices, observed during the calendar year 2017. Due to delays in starting 2017 ICP activities and competing statistical priorities in some economies, not all economies conducted simultaneous household price collection. The collection of prices for household items was spread over a period of twelve months during 2017 and 2018, with the starting month of price collection varying from April to July 2017. Thus, the 12 -month average prices for household items were estimated by the national implementing agencies for the calendar year 2017 using the most detailed consumer price index. Surveys for government compensation, construction, and machinery and equipment were conducted during 2017 and 2018 and referenced to the calendar year 2017. For some economies, rental data was estimated for 2017 based on rental fees collected for 2018. The national accounts data for economies where the accounting year differs from the calendar year were adjusted to the calendar year.

Survey design. All the participating economies were encouraged to implement a self-weighing sampling design in selecting the number of quotations from different outlets, urban and rural areas, towns, and cities. An advantage of such a design is that a simple average of all the price quotations collected would be a reliable estimator of the national average price.

## Data Editing and Validation

The quality of price and national accounts data is paramount in compiling reliable PPPs and real expenditures. The RIA and the ICP Global Office take data validation quite seriously.

## Validation at the Economy Level

The national implementing agencies are responsible for checking price quotations for outliers and ensuring consistency in following the SPDs. The national agencies used software supplied by ADB, the ICP Asia and the Pacific Software Suite, which has extensive functionalities including the generation of survey questionnaires, data entry, basic data, validations,
and diagnostics. The software also helped identify non-sampling errors such as units of measurement and data entry errors. Different price capture tools were also provided for data entry and basic validation on compensation, rental, machinery and equipment and construction surveys, and national accounts expenditure estimates.

## Validation at the Regional Level

The RIA employs a number of sophisticated statistical tools at the regional level to conduct checks on price data provided by participating economies.

Quaranta tables. Eurostat first introduced these tables in the 1990s for data validation in EU regional comparisons. These tables provide an overview of the extent of variability, across the participating economies, in the price data at the item level as well as at the basic heading level. Quaranta tables use the coefficient of variation and the range in price ratios, among other measures, for validating economy data.

Dikhanov tables. Dikhanov tables use residuals from the CPD regressions discussed in the section on index number methods for computing PPPs. These tables make use of residuals from CPD regression at the basic heading level; and residuals from CPD regressions for higher level aggregates such as whole household consumption, government compensation, construction, and machinery and equipment to identify outliers among the PPP ratios and provide measures of price variations for products and economies.

Price changes in the consumer price index versus the International Comparison Program. The RIA developed this novel technique for Asia and the Pacific during the 2011 ICP cycle and further refined and used it to its full potential during the 2017 ICP cycle. Basically, the tool exploits the fact that there are a large number of goods and services in common in the product lists of 2011 and 2017. For each economy, there are prices for a common set of items in 2011 and 2017 which can be used in computing an estimate of price
change based on ICP products, labeled ICP inflation. During the same period, domestic inflation data based on CPI, CPI inflation, is available as an independent measure of price change from 2011 to 2017 . While the ICP and CPI inflations would not be identical, there is an expectation that these two measures not diverge widely. Based on this, the RIA used differences between ICP and CPI inflation as a validation tool and urged participating economies to verify these differences and document the source of deviation as a part of data editing and checking.

## A1.5 Productivity Adjustment Method for Wages and Salaries of Government Employees

The RIA at ADB championed the need for productivity adjustment for comparisons of government compensation. In the 2005 ICP in Asia and the Pacific, the RIA observed that wages and salaries of government employees in many low income economies of the region were too low, resulting in lower price levels and higher volume or real expenditure measures of government expenditure. In some instances, the real per capita government expenditure in some low income economies were at implausibly high levels, most likely because the low wages in fact reflect low productivity levels of employees in these economies, which in turn reflect low levels of capital employed per labor unit. In 2011, the RIA used the methodology described below, which represents a refinement used in the method of 2005 .

Labor productivity in the government sector is difficult to measure because of a variety of measurement issues, including obtaining suitable measures of capital stock in the government sector. The ADB approach makes the simplifying assumption that productivity of labor in the government sector is at a constant proportion to productivity of labor in the whole economy across all the participating economies. This means that if labor productivity in Malaysia is $50 \%$ of that in Hong Kong, China at the economy level, then productivity of labor in government sector is also
assumed to be $50 \%$ of productivity in the sector in Hong Kong, China.

Productivity levels in different economies are estimated under the assumption that all of them follow a CobbDouglas production function with constant returns to scale. ${ }^{5}$ For economy $j$, the production function with capital and labor as inputs is given by:
$Y_{j}=A \cdot K_{j}^{\alpha_{j}} \cdot L_{j}^{\beta_{j}}$ with $\alpha_{j}+\beta_{j}=1$ (constant returns to scale)
where $Y_{j}$ is output (GDP), $K_{j}$ is capital stock, and $L_{j}$ is labor input in economy $j$. Coefficients $\alpha_{j}$ and $\beta_{j}$ represent respectively income shares of capital and labor in $j$-th economy. This equation can be rewritten to express labor productivity as a function of capitallabor ratio:

$$
\frac{Y_{j}}{L_{j}}=A\left(\frac{K_{j}}{L_{j}}\right)^{\alpha_{j}}
$$

To compare labor productivity across economies, the estimate of capital stock of economy $j$ must be expressed in a common currency unit converted using a suitable PPP. Labor is measured in physical units, such as the number of hours worked. If the income share of capital is known, then this formula can compute labor productivity for different economies. If $k_{j}$ represents the capital-labor ratio in $j$-th economy, then labor productivity (LPROD) can be written as:

$$
\operatorname{LPROD}_{j}=\frac{Y_{j}}{L_{j}}=A\left(k_{j}\right)^{\alpha_{j}} \text { where } k_{j}=\frac{K_{j}}{L_{j}}
$$

Then the productivity adjustment is made by dividing wages and salaries with the productivity ratio relative to the base economy of Hong Kong, China:

$$
\frac{\mathrm{LPROD}_{j}}{\operatorname{LPROD}_{\mathrm{HKG}}}=\frac{A\left(k_{j}\right)^{\alpha_{j}}}{A\left(k_{H K G}\right)^{\alpha}}=\frac{\left(k_{j}\right)^{\alpha_{j}}}{\left(k_{H K G}\right)^{\alpha_{H K G}}}
$$

This is the productivity ratio used for adjustment in 2011. ${ }^{6}$ In order to implement this, it is necessary
to have estimates of capital shares in different economies. It was assumed that (i) income shares of labor takes the values $0.5,0.6$, and 0.7 for three groups characterized as low-, middle-, and highincome economies as given below and (ii) the capital share is one minus the labor share.

Labor share of 0.5 and capital share of 0.5 were assumed for Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, India, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

Labor share of 0.6 and capital share of 0.4 were assumed for Fiji, Indonesia, the People's Republic of China, the Philippines, and Viet Nam.

Labor share of 0.7 and capital share of 0.3 were assumed for Brunei Darussalam; Hong Kong, China; Macau, China; Malaysia; Singapore; Taipei,China; and Thailand. ${ }^{7}$

## Productivity Adjustment Method for 2017: The Inklaar Method

The Inklaar method (Inklaar, 2019) represents a further refinement to the productivity adjustment method introduced and implemented by ADB in the 2005 and 2011 ICP cycles. It addresses two critical deficiencies of the ADB method described above. First, although the ADB method of 2011 provided a set of transitive labor productivity adjustment factors, it is not base invariant: use of PPPs relative to a reference currency other than the Hong Kong dollar would give a different set of adjustment factors. Second, in the ADB method, the estimates of income shares of labor and capital were somewhat ad hoc and broadly based. The Inklaar productivity adjustments make use of properly estimated and calibrated labor shares (Inklaar and Timmer 2013a; and Inklaar 2019).

[^25]The transitive and base-invariant measures of labor productivity from the Inklaar method are given by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{LPROD}_{j}= & \left(\frac{k_{j}}{\bar{k}}\right)^{\frac{a_{j+1}+\bar{a}}{2}} \text { where } \bar{k}=\prod_{j=1}^{22}\left(k_{j}\right)^{1 / 22} \\
& \text { and } \bar{\alpha}=\frac{1}{22} \sum_{j=1}^{22} \alpha_{j}
\end{aligned}
$$

Productivity of economy $j$ relative to the economy of Hong Kong, China is simply the ratio of labor productivities in economy $j$ and in Hong Kong, China.

The income shares of labor used in the application of the Inklaar methodology for Asia and the Pacific are in Table A1.2.

Table A1.2: Income Shares of Labor: ADB and Estimated Shares from Inklaar, 2011

| Economy | Inklaar | ADB |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bangladesh | 0.4370 | 0.5000 |
| Bhutan | 0.4380 | 0.5000 |
| Brunei Darussalam | 0.4680 | 0.7000 |
| Cambodia | 0.3860 | 0.5000 |
| China, People's Republic of | 0.5500 | 0.6000 |
| Fiji | 0.4886 | 0.6000 |
| Hong Kong, China | 0.5156 | 0.7000 |
| India | 0.5127 | 0.5000 |
| Indonesia | 0.4592 | 0.6000 |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | 0.3976 | 0.5000 |
| Macau, China | 0.3383 | 0.7000 |
| Malaysia | 0.3571 | 0.7000 |
| Maldives | 0.4170 | 0.5000 |
| Mongolia | 0.3778 | 0.5000 |
| Myanmar | 0.4550 | 0.5000 |
| Nepal | 0.4040 | 0.5000 |
| Pakistan | 0.4200 | 0.5000 |
| Philippines | 0.3622 | 0.6000 |
| Singapore | 0.4395 | 0.7000 |
| Sri Lanka | 0.3104 | 0.5000 |
| Taipei,China | 0.6675 | 0.7000 |
| Thailand | 0.3928 | 0.7000 |
| Viet Nam | 0.4390 | 0.6000 |

ADB = Asian Development Bank.
Note: Shaded cells indicate that Inklaar estimates are not available and show labor shares from the International Labour Organization.
Sources: Asian Development Bank. 2014. Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures. Manila. 131; Groningen Growth and Development Centre. Penn World Table version 9.1. https://www.rug.nl/ggdc/productivity/pwt/ (accessed 9 December 2019); Robert C. Feenstra et al. 2015. The Next Generation of the Penn World Table. American Economic Review. 105 (10). pp. 3150-3182. www.ggdc.net/pwt; and International Labour Organization. SDG Labour Market Indicators. https://www.ilo.org/shinyapps/bulke xplorer20/?lang=en\&segment=indicator\&id=SDG_1041_NOC_RT_A (accessed 28 November 2019)

The Inklaar method, along with the new income shares of labor and capital, resulted in significant downward revisions to productivity estimates of all the economies (except for the reference economy,

Hong Kong, China). As a result, price level indexes (PLIs) for all the economies have increased and real expenditures were adjusted downward (see Chapter 5).

## A1.6 Methodology for Global Linking: Linking Asia and the Pacific to the Rest of the World

The most important task performed by the ICP Global Office in any given ICP cycle is to bring together price and real expenditure comparisons from different regions and produce global comparisons expressed relative to a selected reference economy. As in the past, the United States is the reference economy and the US dollar is the reference currency. This section briefly explains the methodology used by the ICP Global Office to produce global PPPs and results using PPPs and other data finalized by the regional agencies. The linking procedure used in the 2017 ICP cycle is the same as that used in 2011.

All the 176 participating economies in the 2017 cycle belong to the following six regions: Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Commonwealth of Independent States, Latin America and the Caribbean, Western Asia, and Eurostat-OECD. Some countries, like Egypt, are included in two different regions, but the description below does not go into all the technical details; rather, it provides an overall picture of the linking method and how linking works.

Stage I. All the regional implementing agencies implement the ICP in their respective regions, using procedures similar to those outlined in this appendix, then compile the following results and submit them to the ICP Global Office:

- Purchasing power parities. The PPPs for the currencies of all the participating economies (22 in the case of Asia and the Pacific) are at the basic heading level, for all the 155 basic headings. These PPPs are expressed relative to the reference currency of the respective regions; in Asia
and the Pacific, all the PPPs are relative to the Hong Kong dollar.
- National accounts data. The data include GDP and expenditure share weights for all 155 basic headings.
- Additional data. All the regions provide prices of all the goods and services included in the global core product lists for household consumption including education and health, government compensation, dwellings, machinery and equipment, and construction.

Stage II. The ICP Global Office links all the regional price comparisons using price data for the global core products. The linking method used is the country aggregation and reallocation of volumes (CAR-Volume) method. This method satisfies the fixity principle.

The fixity principle ensures that the global comparisons, compiled by linking all the regional comparisons, will maintain the same relative price levels and real expenditures or volumes between participating economies of the regions compiled at the regional level. For example, if the size of real GDP of the People's Republic of China is 2.44 times that of India in the comparisons for Asia and the Pacific (in Hong Kong dollars), the relative size of People's Republic of China would still be 2.44 times that of India in the global comparisons (expressed in US dollars).

The following steps are involved in the linking process, though there are deviations from this process when aggregates such as construction, education, health, and housing are linked. ${ }^{8}$

1. Basic heading PPPs from different regions are linked using linking factors computed using global core prices collected by all the economies in the ICP. First, global core prices of items collected in a given region are converted into the units of the reference currency of the region
using PPPs for that basic heading. For example, for the basic heading of rice, global core prices collected by the 22 economies are converted into Hong Kong dollars using PPPs for the basic heading of rice in the region. The same procedure is used to convert global core prices from the other regions.
2. Linking factors for a given basic heading are then estimated by running a CPD regression on the global core prices expressed in the reference currencies of the six regions. For example, for Asia and the Pacific, the linking factor shows the number of Hong Kong dollars that are equivalent to one US dollar for that basic heading.
3. The basic heading PPPs for all the 155 basic headings supplied by all the regions are expressed relative to the US dollar using the estimated linking factors. This results in a matrix with 155 rows, with one row for each basic heading such as rice, and each row with 176 entries that correspond to each of the participating economies.
4. These basic heading PPPs are combined with national accounts data on expenditure shares using the GEKS method, resulting in globally linked PPPs for GDP. Using these PPPs, the total real GDP is computed for each region and then redistributed using shares of economies computed at the regional level. This is the redistribution step in the CAR-Volume method.
5. Once the real GDP of each economy in each region is computed, then PPPs for the currencies of each economy is expressed relative to the reference currency, the US dollar.
6. Steps (1) to (5) are repeated for computing PPPs and real expenditures for other aggregates like ICEH and NPISH, GFCE, and GFCF.

The ICP Global Office compiles results for all the desired aggregates and publishes them in their report for the 2017 ICP cycle.
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## Appendix 2: Membership of the Regional Advisory Board in the International Comparison Program for Asia and the Pacific

| Members from Implementing Agencies |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Commissioner, Census and Statistics Department, Hong Kong, China |
|  | Chief Statistician of India and Secretary, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation |
|  | Chief Statistician, Badan Pusat Statistik, Indonesia |
|  | Head, Lao Statistics Bureau, Lao People's Democratic Republic |
|  | Director General, International Statistical Information Center, National Bureau of Statistics of China, People's Republic of China |
|  | Director General, Department of Census and Statistics, Sri Lanka |
|  | Director General, General Statistics Office, Viet Nam |
|  |  |
| Institutional Members |  |
|  | Chief Economist, Asian Development Bank |
|  | General Manager, Macroeconomic Statistics Division, Australian Bureau of Statistics |
|  | Director, Statistics Division, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific |
|  | Director, United Nations Statistical Institute for Asia and the Pacific |
|  |  |
| Ex-Officio Members |  |
|  | Advisor, Office of the Chief Economist and Director General and Head, Statistics and Data Innovation Unit, Asian Development Bank ${ }^{1}$ |
|  | Director, Development Data Group, World Bank |
|  |  |
| Member Secretary | Regional Coordinator, International Comparison Program (ICP) Asia and the Pacific, Asian Development Bank |
|  |  |
| Secretariat | Asian Development Bank ICP Team |

1Effective 3 February 2020 onward. Formerly, Director of Development Indicators and Policy Research Division, Economic Research and Regional Cooperation Department. Source: 2017 International Comparison Program for Asia and the Pacific.

Appendix 3: Participating Economies: Implementing Agencies and Local Currency Units

| Economy | Implementing Agency | Local Currency Units |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bangladesh | Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics | taka (Tk) |
| Bhutan | National Statistics Bureau | ngultrum (Nu) |
| Brunei Darussalam | Department of Economic Planning and Statistics | Brunei dollar(s) (B\$) |
| Cambodia | National Institute of Statistics | riel(s) (KR) |
| China, People's Republic of | National Bureau of Statistics of China | yuan (CNY) |
| Fiji | Fiji Bureau of Statistics | Fiji dollar(s) (F\$) |
| Hong Kong, China | Census and Statistics Department | Hong Kong dollar(s) (HK\$) |
| India | Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation | Indian rupee(s) (₹) |
| Indonesia | Badan Pusat Statistik | rupiah (Rp) |
| Lao People's Democratic Republic | Lao Statistics Bureau | kip (KN) |
| Malaysia | Department of Statistics | ringgit (RM) |
| Maldives | National Bureau of Statistics | rufiyaa (Rf) |
| Mongolia | National Statistics Office | togrog (MNT) |
| Myanmar | Central Statistical Organization | kyat(s) (MK) |
| Nepal | Central Bureau of Statistics | Nepalese rupee(s) (NRe) |
| Pakistan | Pakistan Bureau of Statistics | Pakistani rupee(s) (PRe/PRs) |
| Philippines | Philippine Statistics Authority | peso(s) (P) |
| Singapore | Department of Statistics | Singapore dollar(s) (S\$) |
| Sri Lanka | Department of Census and Statistics | Sri Lankan rupee(s) (SLRe/SLRS)) |
| Taipei,China | Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting, and Statistics | NT dollar(s) (NT\$) |
| Thailand | Trade Policy and Strategy Office | baht (B) |
| Viet Nam | General Statistics Office | dong (D) |
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## Appendix 4: Detailed Tables: Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures, 2017

The succeeding tables present the 2017 key results for Asia and the Pacific for broad aggregates of gross domestic product (GDP). These include the actual individual consumption by household (AICH), individual consumption expenditure by household (ICEH) and nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH), collective consumption expenditure by government, government final consumption expenditure (GFCE), gross fixed capital formation (GFCF), change in inventories and net acquisitions of valuables, and balance of exports and imports. These aggregates were derived using the Gini-Eltetö-Köves-Szulc (GEKS) method, so real expenditures are not additive within a particular economy. The results presented in these tables are produced by the ICP Asia Pacific regional implementing agency, based on data supplied by all the participating economies, and in accordance with the methodology recommended by the ICP Technical Advisory Group and approved by the Asia and the Pacific Regional Advisory Board. As such, these results are not produced by participating economies as part of the economies' official statistics.

Table A4.1 Purchasing Power Parities, 2017 (Hong Kong, China as base)
Table A4.2 Price Level Indexes, 2017 (Hong Kong, China = 100)
Table A4.3 Price Level Indexes, 2017 (Asia and the Pacific = 100)
Table A4.4 Real Expenditure, 2017 (billion Hong Kong dollars)
Table A4.5 Economy Shares of Real Expenditure to Asia and the Pacific, 2017 (\%)
Table A4.6 Per Capita Real Expenditure, 2017 (Hong Kong dollars)
Table A4.7 Per Capita Real Expenditure Index, 2017 (Asia and the Pacific = 100)
Table A4.8 Nominal Expenditure, 2017 (billion Hong Kong dollars)
Table A4.9 Economy Shares of Nominal Expenditure to Asia and the Pacific, 2017 (\%)
Table A4.10 Per Capita Nominal Expenditure, 2017 (Hong Kong dollars)
Table A4.11 Per Capita Nominal Expenditure Index, 2017 (Asia and the Pacific =100)
Table A4.12 Shares of Nominal Expenditure, 2017 (\%)

## Expenditure Category

Gross Domestic Product
Actual Individual Consumptit
Food and non-alcoholic beverages
reand fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and nonClothing and footwear
Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels Health and education
Health
Transportation and communication
Transportation
Recreation and cultur
Other consumption expenditure items
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Collective Consumption Expenditure by Goverrment Gross Fixed Capital Formation
Construction
Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables
Balance of Exports and Imports
Recreation and culture
Restaurants and hotels
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BAN = Bangladesh; $\operatorname{BHU}=$ Bhutan; BRU = Brunei Darussalam; CAM = Cambodia; FIJ = Fiji; HKG = Hong Kong, China; $\operatorname{IND}=$ India; $\operatorname{INO}=$ Indonesia; LAO = Lao People's Democratic Republic; MAL = Malaysia; MLD $=$ Maldives;
MON = Mongolia; MYA = Myanmar; NEP = Nepal; NPISH=nonprofit institutions serving households; PAK = Pakistan; PHI = Philippines; PRC = People's Republic of China; SIN = Singapore; SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei, China; THA = Thailand; $\mathrm{VIE}=\mathrm{Viet} \mathrm{Nam}$.
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## Expenditure Category

Gross Domestic Product
Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Food and non-alcoholic beverages

Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages Clothing Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels Health and education

Health

Transportation and communication Transportation

Restaurants and hotels Other consumption expenditure items Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation

Machinery and equipment Construction

Balance of Exports and Imports
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure All goods

Non-durables Durables MON = Mongolia
VIE $=$ Viet Nam.


















跃出 羊

























| Expenditure Category |
| :--- |
| Gross Domestic Product |
| Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Food and non-alcoholic beverages |
| Food |
| Bread and cereals |
| Meat and fish |
| Fruits and vegetables |
| Other food and non-alcoholic beverages |
| Clothing and footwear |
| Clothing |
| Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels |
| Health and education |
| Health |
| Education |
| Transportation and communication |
| Transportation |
| Recreation and culture |
| Restaurants and hotels |
| Other consumption expenditure items |
| Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government |
| Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government |
| Gross Fixed Capital Formation |
| Machinery and equipment |
| Construction |
| Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables |
| Balance of Exports and Imports |
| Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH |
| Government Final Consumption Expenditure |
| Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| All goods |
| Non-durables |
| Semi-durables |
| Durables |

 SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei, China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.

Note: Each real aggregate value is derived by using a purchasing power parity that is specific to that aggregate, so real aggregates may not sum up to the total of their real components for an economy.
a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government. Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.
























## Expenditure Category

Actual Individual Consumption by Householdsa Food and non-alcoholic beverages

Bread and cereals Meat and fish

Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages Clothing Health and education

Edeatcation Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Actual Ind

Non-durables Durables


Note: Each real aggregate value is derived by using a purchasing power parity that is specific to that aggregate, so real aggregates may not sum up to the total of their real components for an economy. Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.
Expenditure Category
Gross Domestic Product Households $^{\text {a }}$
Food
Bread and cereals
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages
Clothing and footwear
Clothing
Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels
Health and education
Health
Transportation
Recreation and culture
Other consumption expenditure items
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation
Machinery and equipment
Construction
Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables
Balance of Exports and Imports Government Final Consumption Expenditure
Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$
All goods
Non-durables Durables
Services
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 (Asia and the Pacific $=100$ )

## Expenditure Category

Gross Domestic Product
Actual Individual Consumption by Householdsa
Food
Bread and cereals Meat and fish

Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages Clothing and
Clothing

Education
Balance of Exports and Imports
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure All goods

Non-durables
Semi-durables
Durables
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Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages Clothing and footwear

Clothing
Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels Health and education

Health
Transportation and communication
Transportation
Recreation and culture
Other consumption expenditure items
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation

Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables Balance of Exports and Imports Government Final Consumption Expenditure Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ All goods

| Non-durables |
| :--- |
| Semi-durables | Durables
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## Expenditure Category

 Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Food and non-alcoholic beveragesBied and ceceals
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages Clothing and footwear
Clothing Health and education
Health
Education
Transportation and communication
Transportation
Recreation and cult
Other consumption expenditure items
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation
Machinery and equipment
Construction
Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables
Balance of Exports and Imports
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$

 Services

[^32]Table A4．10：Per Capita Nominal Expenditure， 2017 （Hong Kong dollars）
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 Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{a}$ All goods

Non－durables Durables

## Expenditure Category

Gross Domestic Product Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Food
Food and non－alcoholic beverages
Bread and cereal
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non－alcoholic beverages Clothing and footwear Clothing
Housing，water，electricity，gas and other fuels
Health and education
Health
Education
Transportation and communication
Transportation
Transportation
Recreation and cult
Restaurantsand hotere items
Other consumption expenditure items
Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation

Machinery and equipment
Construction
Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables Balance of Exports and Imports Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure

Non－durables
Semi－durables
Durables Democratic Republic；MAL＝Malaysia；MLD＝Maldives；MON＝Mong a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households，nonprofit institutions serving households，and government． Source：Asian Development Bank estimates．






















 People's Democratic Republic; MAL = Malaysia; MLD = Maldives; MON = Mongolia; M SIN = Singapore; SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei,China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.
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## Expenditure Category

Gross Domestic Product Food and non-alcoholic beverages
toed
Bread and cereals
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and nonClothing and footwear

## Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels

 Health and educationHealth Transportation
Recreation and culture
Restaurants and hotels
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation
Machinery and equipment
Construction
Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables
Balance of Exports and Imports Government Final Consumption Expenditure
Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ All goods
Non-durables
Durables
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## Appendix 5: Detailed Tables: Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures, 2011 Revised

The succeeding tables present the 2011 revised key results for Asia and the Pacific for broad aggregates of gross domestic product (GDP). These include the actual individual consumption by household (AICH), individual consumption expenditure by household (ICEH) and nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH), collective consumption expenditure by government, government final consumption expenditure (GFCE), gross fixed capital formation (GFCF), change in inventories and net acquisitions of valuables, and balance of exports and imports. These aggregates were derived using the Gini-Eltetö-Köves-Szulc (GEKS) method, so real expenditures are not additive within a particular economy. The 2011 revised results are based on revisions in the 2011 estimates of GDP, population, refinements in the methodology for estimating productivity adjustment factors, changes in some reference purchasing power parities (PPPs), and changes in International Comparison Program (ICP) classification (see Appendix 6, Table A6.2). The results presented in these tables are produced by the ICP Asia Pacific regional implementing agency, based on data supplied by all the participating economies, and in accordance with the methodology recommended by the ICP Technical Advisory Group and approved by the Asia and the Pacific Regional Advisory Board. As such, these results are not produced by participating economies as part of the economies' official statistics.

Table A5.1 Purchasing Power Parities, 2011 (Hong Kong, China as base)
Table A5.2 Price Level Indexes, 2011 (Hong Kong, China = 100)
Table A5.3 Price Level Indexes, 2011 (Asia and the Pacific = 100)
Table A5.4 Real Expenditure, 2011 (billion Hong Kong dollars)
Table A5.5 Economy Shares of Real Expenditure to Asia and the Pacific, 2011 (\%)
Table A5.6 Per Capita Real Expenditure, 2011 (Hong Kong dollars)
Table A5.7 Per Capita Real Expenditure Index, 2011 (Asia and the Pacific = 100)
Table A5.8 Nominal Expenditure, 2011 (billion Hong Kong dollars)
Table A5.9 Economy Shares of Nominal Expenditure to Asia and the Pacific, 2011 (\%)
Table A5.10 Per Capita Nominal Expenditure, 2011 (Hong Kong dollars)
Table A5.11 Per Capita Nominal Expenditure Index, 2011 (Asia and the Pacific = 100)
Table A5.12 Shares of Nominal Expenditure, 2011 (\%)
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 B Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$

## Expenditure Category Gross Domestic Product

Food
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages Clothing and footwear
Clothing Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels Health and education Health

## Transportation and communication

Transportation
Recreation and culture
Other consumption expenditure items Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation
Machinery and equipment
Construction

## Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables

 Balance of Exports and Imports Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ All goodsNon-durables Durables

## Services

 MON = Mongolia; MYA = Myanmar; NEP = Nepal; NPISH=nonprofit institutions serving households; PAK = Pakistan; PHI = Philippines; PRC = People's Republic of China; $\operatorname{SIN}=$ Singapore; SRI $=$ SriL Lanka; TAP $=$ Taipei, China; THA $=$ Thailand; a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government. Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.
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## Expenditure Category

Gross Domestic Product
Actual Individual Consumption by Householdsa Food and non－alcoholic beverages

Bread and cereals
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non－alco Clothing and footwear Health and education

Education
Transportation and communication Transportation
Recreation and cultu

Restaurants and hotels enditure items
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation Construction Change in Inventories and Net Acq Balance of Exports and Imports Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure All goods

Non－durables
Semi－durables Durables
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Expenditure Category Actual Individual Consumption by Food and non-alcoholic beverages

## Food Bread and cereals

 Meat and fish Fruits and vegetables Clothing and footwear Housing, water, electric Health and education Health
## Education

Transportation
Recreation and culture
Restaurants and hotels
Other consumption expenditure items Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation Machinery and equipment Construction Change in Inven

Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure All goods

Non-durables Durables Services THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.

[^36]Table A5.4: Real Expenditure, 2011 (Revised) (Billion Hong Kong dollars)
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Bread and cereals
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverages Clothing
Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels Health and education
Health
Transportation and communication Transportation

[^37]Other consumption expenditure items Individual Consumption Expenditure by Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government
Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation

## Construction <br> Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables

Balance of Exports and Imports Government Final Consumption Expenditure
Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{a}$
All goods



Note: Each real aggregate value is derived by using a purchasing power parity that is specific to that aggregate, so real aggregates may not sum up to the total of their real components for an economy.
a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.
























| Expenditure Category |
| :--- |
| Gross Domestic Product |
| Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Food and non-alcoholic beverages |
| Food |
| Bread and cereals |
| Meat and fish |
| Fruits and vegetables |
| Other food and non-alcoholic beverages |
| Clothing and footwear |
| Clothing |
| Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels |
| Health and education |
| Health |
| Education |
| Transportation and communication |
| Transportation |
| Recreation and culture |
| Restaurants and hotels |
| Other consumption expenditure items |
| Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government |
| Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government |
| Gross Fixed Capital Formation |
| Machinery and equipment |
| Construction |
| Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables |
| Balance of Exports and Imports |
| Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH |
| Government Final Consumption Expenditure |
| Actual Individual Consumption by Households |
| All goods |
| Non-durables |
| Semi-durables |
| Durables |
| Services |
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 훈 폰 PAK華 $\frac{\pi}{2}$
$\frac{2}{2}$
$\frac{1}{2}$

$\frac{1}{2}$古范 안 INO 른 | BAN | BHU | BRU | CAM | FIJ | HKG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14,715 | 39,896 | 439,565 | 13,888 | 47,339 | 273,549 |
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 Gross Domestic Product Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Food and non-alcoholic beverages

## Bread and cereals

 Meat and $f$ ishFruits and vegetables Clothing and footwear

## Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels

 Health and educationHealth

| Transportation and communication |
| :--- |
| Transportation |
| Recreation and culture |
| Restaurants and hotels |
| Other consumption expenditure items |


| Transportation and communication |
| :--- |
| Transportation |
| Recreation and culture |
| Restaurants and hotels |
| Other consumption expenditure items |


| Transportation and communication |
| :--- |
| Transportation |
| Recreation and culture |
| Restaurants and hotels |
| Other consumption expenditure items |

Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Gross Fixed Capital Formation
Machinery and equipment
Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables
Balance of Exports and Imports
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH Government Final Consumption Expenditure All goods
Non-durables Durables
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| Expenditure Category |
| :--- |
| Gross Domestic Product |
| Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Food and non－alcoholic beverages |
| Food |
| Bread and cereals |
| Meat and fish |
| Fruits and vegetables |
| Other food and non－alcoholic beverages |
| Clothing and footwear |
| Clothing |
| Housing，water，electricity，gas and other fuels |
| Health and education |
| Health |
| Education |
| Transportation and communication |
| Transportation |
| Recreation and culture |
| Restaurants and hotels |
| Other consumption expenditure items |
| Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government |
| Collective Consumption Expenditure by Government |
| Gross Fixed Capital Formation |
| Machinery and equipment |
| Construction |
| Change in Inventories and Net Acquisitions of Valuables |
| Balance of Exports and Imports |
| Individual Consumption Expenditure by Households and NPISH |
| Government Final Consumption Expenditure |
| Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| All goods |
| Non－durables |
| Semi－durables |
| Durables |
| Services |

Table A5．10：Per Capita Nominal Expenditure， 2011 （Revised） （Hong Kong dollars）




発栥劳志志 | $8 \% \tau^{\prime} \varepsilon$ |
| :--- |
| $\varepsilon เ 8^{\circ} \mathrm{O}$ | ${ }^{\text {T8 }} 855^{2} 9$ 훙
















 | BAN | BHU | BRU |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6,911 | 20,851 | 366,586 | $\begin{array}{lll}5,212 & 10,321 & 62,743 \\ 2,645 & 2,998 & 7,878\end{array}$



 | 505 | 340 | 2,537 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 358 | 761 | 1,275 | $\stackrel{?}{\sim}$ ※




 $\begin{array}{rrr}1,43 & -57 & -5,432 \\ -531 & -6,106 & 144,701\end{array}$

 $\begin{array}{lll}3,947 & 6,076 & 22,903\end{array}$
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## Expenditure Category

Gross Domestic Product
Actual Individual Consumption by Households ${ }^{a}$
Food and non-alcoholic beverages
Food
Bread and cereals
Meat and fish
Fruits and vegetables
Other food and non-alcoholic beverage Clothing and footwear Clothing Housing, water, electricity Health

Transportation and communication
Transportation
Recreation and culture
Other consumption expenditure items
Individual Consumption Expenditure by Government Collective Consumption Expen

Machinery and equipment
Construction
Balance of Exports and Imports Government Final Consumption Expenditure All goods

Non-durables Durables MAL = Malaysia; MLD $=$ Maldives $;$ MON $=$ Mongolia; $M$ TAP = Taipei,China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.
a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.
Table A5.12: Shares of Nominal Expenditure, 2011 (Revised)
(\%)

| BAN | BHU | RU | CAM | FIJ | HKG | IND | INO | LAO | MAC | MAL | MLD | MON | MYA | NEP | PAK | PHI | PRC | SIN | SRI | TAP | THA | VIE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100.0 | 100 | 00. | 100 | 100.0 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 10 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | . 00 | 00.00 | 100.0 | 100.00 | 100.0 | 100. | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| 75.42 | 49.50 | 17.12 | 84.27 | 74.37 | 66.66 | 59.02 | 58.81 | 62.58 | 23.83 | 54.49 | 37.42 | 57.05 | 61.3 | 79.7 | 84.88 | 77.58 | 42.91 | 39.92 | 75.26 | 62.12 | 61.97 | 63.41 | 50.37 |
| 38.27 | 14 | 2.15 | 37.58 | 25.6 | 7.11 | 17.04 | 17.87 | 23. | 1.73 | 10.42 | 8.21 | 16.42 | 35.2 | 44.98 | 37.50 | 31.45 | 8.06 | 2.54 | 1.9 | 7.14 | 15.61 | 19.09 |  |
| 38.12 | 13.67 | 1.93 | 36.01 | 24.06 | 6.82 | . 71 | .46 | 20.0 | 1.65 | 9.96 | 7.12 | 15.06 | 34.38 | 4.37 | 36.02 | 29.04 | 7.86 | 2.27 | 1.52 | 6.67 | 13.67 | 8.45 |  |
| 17.0 | 3.81 | 0.43 | 11.53 | 5.02 | 0.63 | 4.12 | 4.93 | 5.30 | 0.28 | 1.42 | 1.88 | 1.73 | 9. 36 | 18.3 | 8.42 | 10 | 1.71 | 0.40 | 7.44 | 1.53 | 3.03 | 5.51 |  |
| 7.30 | 1.63 | 0.69 | 11.12 | 5.72 | 3.83 | 1.35 | 4.42 | 8.89 | 0.73 | 3.36 | 2.13 | 5.16 | 10.6 | 7.34 | 3.39 | 10. | 2.61 | 0.86 | 2.79 | 2.11 | 3.41 | 7.63 |  |
| 5.18 | 3.65 | 0.35 | 5.41 | 7.01 | 0.85 | 4.51 | 2.56 | 3.13 | 0.36 | 2.05 | 1.34 | 1.75 | 22 | . 63 | 4.91 | 3.35 | 2.01 | 0.42 | 2.38 | 2.03 | 4.70 | 2.68 |  |
| 8.78 | 5.29 | 0.68 | 9.53 | 7.94 | 1.80 | 7.06 | 5.96 | 5.92 | 0.35 | 3.60 | 2.85 | 7.78 | 99 | 1.62 | 20.78 | 7.40 | 1.73 | 0.85 | 9.38 | 1.47 | 4.47 | 3.27 |  |
| 4.5 | 3.61 | 0.54 | 1.59 | 3.35 | 3.10 | 3.54 | 2.25 | 1.28 | 1.32 | 1.45 | 0.91 | 2.64 | 2.15 | 1.97 | 3.94 | 1.04 | 2.97 | 1.06 | 3.81 | 2.43 | 1.93 | 2.93 |  |
| 4.05 | 2.44 | 0.45 | 0.81 | 2.76 | 2.09 | 2.84 | 1.96 | . 02 | 1.01 | 1.27 | 0.7 | 2.33 | 1.85 | 1.64 | 3.2 | 0.72 | 2.46 | 0.8 | 3.5 | 2.11 | 1.83 | 2.4 |  |
| 13.02 | 8.64 | 1.92 | 12.4 | 6.9 | 10.87 | 9.17 | 5.24 | 7.00 | 3.35 | 8.10 | 10.33 | 8.49 | 9.17 | 8.96 | 16.31 | 9.27 | 5.95 | 6.3 | 6.87 | 10.05 | 5.0 | 14.37 |  |
| 6.88 | 10.20 | . 72 | 11.6 | 10.59 | 9.48 | 6.88 | 7.46 | 3.88 | 3.2 | 8.33 | 6.47 | 8. 3 | 4.43 | 7.50 | 9.4 | 7.49 | 10.75 | 6.4 | 6.85 | 11.40 | 10.78 | 10.37 |  |
| 2.76 | 5.6 | . 22 | 5.94 | 3.11 | 5.07 | 2.77 | . 79 | . 91 | 1.63 | 3.17 | 2.95 | 2.5 | 2.58 | 3.29 | 5.3 | 2.1 | 6.44 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 5.86 | 5.07 | 4.89 |  |
| 4.12 | 52 | 3.50 | . 71 | 7.48 | 41 | 4.12 | 4.66 | 1.97 | 1.65 | 5.16 | 3.52 | 5.7 | 1.85 | . 20 | 4.0 | 5.3 | 4.32 | 3.47 | 3.0 | 5.54 | 5.71 | 5.48 |  |
| 3.53 | . 85 | 2.88 | 6.47 | 9.23 | 6.04 | 9.76 | 10.19 | . 03 | 2.46 | 10.40 | 4.84 | 11.70 | 3.04 | 3.42 | 6.85 | 10.26 | 3.96 | 6.62 | 13.50 | 8.78 | 9.84 | 7.02 |  |
| 3.17 | 4.66 | 2.24 | 6.26 | 6.2 | 4.67 | 8. | 7.53 | 6.68 | 1.86 | 6.78 | 1.73 | 9.89 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 5.44 | 7.94 | 2.51 | 4.79 | 12.82 | 6.61 | 8.58 | 6.50 |  |
| 0.55 | 3.04 | 1.07 | . 31 | 1.60 | 7.52 | 0.64 | 2.57 | 1.10 | 2.20 | 3.45 | 0.82 | 1.63 | 0.70 | 3.15 | 0.9 | 1.35 | 2.3 | 5.22 | 7.3 | 5.3 | 2.72 | 2.79 |  |
| 1.71 | 0.56 | 0.7 | 03 | 0.95 | 6.4 | 1.32 | 4.92 | 6.43 | 4.06 | 4.84 | . 81 | 0.92 | 2.71 | 1.55 | 0.87 | 2.72 | 2.1 | 3.68 | 2.4 | 3.9 | 4.83 | 2.86 |  |
| 6.92 | 3.22 | 1.62 | 6.96 | 16.05 | 16.08 | 10.95 | 8.32 | 12.48 | 2.97 | 10.73 | 5.03 | 6.37 | 36 | 8.48 | 9.05 | 14.01 | 6.7 | 8.47 | 12.8 | 3.1 | 1.22 | 8.14 |  |
| 1.4 | 7.9 | 4.3 | 4.70 | 5.9 | 3.36 | 3.23 | 3.39 | 1.69 | 2.78 | 6.52 | 4.40 | 5.56 | 0.9 | 3.28 | 3.05 | 4.11 | 8.55 | 3.34 | 4.01 | 7.63 | 7.86 | 4.48 |  |
| 3.64 | 12.13 | 14.39 | 3.71 | 10.0 | 5.3 | 7.87 | 5.6 | 7.06 | 4.3 | 6.75 | 17.01 | 6.69 | 11.0 | 6.3 | 7.0 | 5.5 | 6.25 | 5.8 | 4.55 | 7.52 | 8.63 | 5.9 |  |
| 27.87 | 67 | . 50 | . 5 | 18.3 | 23.54 | 33 | 31.31 | 32.29 | 12.48 | 22.08 | 33.53 | 8.41 | 31.22 | 21.41 | 13.02 | 18.74 | 45.59 | 25.24 | 26.29 | 23.39 | 26.3 | 29.75 |  |
| 6.16 | 26 | 10.19 | 4.92 | 11.4 | 10.32 | 10.04 | 5.90 | 4.94 | 2.43 | 8.05 | 1.1 | 26.80 | 14.4 | 4.66 | 3.85 | 5.91 | 12.6 | 8.0 | 14.6 | 9.64 | 16.9 | 7.60 |  |
| 20.89 | 39 | 18.28 | 5.77 | 5.61 | 11.0 | 19. | 22.88 | 15.80 | . 48 | 10.75 | 22.34 | 16.12 | 12.56 | 11.9 | 6.22 | 9.34 | 28.77 | 13.07 | 10.9 | 8.99 | 8.27 | 20 |  |
| 0.76 | -0.2 | -1.48 | 0.5 | 2.7 | 0.61 | 5.54 | 1.74 | 1.34 | 1.35 | 1.11 | 0.51 | 9.74 | 0.11 | 16. | 1.60 | 1.73 | 2.68 | 1.43 | 7.10 | 0.25 | 1.00 | 5.06 |  |
| -7.69 | -29.2 | 39.4 | -0, | -5.4 | 3.85 | -5 | 2. | -3 | 58 | 15 | 11.54 | -21.89 | -3.74 | -24.02 | -6. | -3, | 2.57 | 27.53 | -13.19 | 6.73 | 2.03 | -4.13 |  |
| 73.99 | 41.56 | 12.78 | 79.5 | 68.46 | 63.3 | 55.79 | 55.42 | 60.90 | 21.05 | 47.97 | 33.02 | 51.49 | 60.43 | 76.46 | 81.83 | 73. | 34.36 | 3.58 | 71.2 | 54.49 | 54.10 | 58.94 |  |
| 5.07 | 20.0 | 18.73 | 8.41 | 15.99 | 8.71 | 11.10 | 9.06 | 8.75 | 7.12 | 13.27 | 21.41 | 12.26 | 11.99 | 9.58 | 10.13 | 9.70 | 14.81 | 9.23 | 8.56 | 15.15 | 16.49 | 10.39 |  |
| 75.42 | 49.50 | 17.12 | 84.27 | 74.3 | 66.66 | 59.02 | 58.81 | 62.58 | 23.83 | 7.49 | 37.42 | 57.05 | 1.36 | 79.74 | 84.88 | 77.58 | 42.91 | 39.92 | 75.26 | 2.12 | 61.97 | 63.41 |  |
| 57.11 | 29.14 | 6.25 | 56.53 | 46.37 | 24.2 | 32.38 | 35.22 | 43.64 | 6.75 | 7.65 | 17.19 | 30.35 | 47.52 | 58.02 | 60.04 | 49.34 | 22.26 | 11.97 | 39.0 | 26.48 | 33.7 | 41.25 |  |
| 49.11 | 22.25 | 3.78 | 49.64 | 37.65 | 11.96 | 26.04 | 24.89 | 34.38 | 3.40 | 20.93 | 13.78 | 24.38 | 44.18 | 52.04 | 52.44 | 44.63 | 14.39 | 5.66 | 30.01 | 14.8 | 24.96 | 30.80 |  |
| 5.36 | 4.36 | 1.13 | 2.46 | 3.68 | 5.60 | 4.10 | 4.27 | 2.63 | 1.69 | 2.59 | 1.44 | 3.37 | 2.29 | 2.82 | 5.01 | 2.30 | 4.21 | 2.18 | 7.6 | 5.19 | 3.82 | 3.98 |  |
| 2.64 | 2.53 | 1.33 | 4.43 | 5.04 | 6.64 | 2.24 | 6.06 | 6.64 | 1.67 | 4.13 | 1.97 | 2.61 | 1.0 | 3.15 | 2.58 | 2.4 | 3.66 | 4.14 | 1.3 | 6.4 | 4.93 | 6.46 |  |
| 15.5 | 12.4 | 5.09 | 18.73 | 19 | 36 | 23.71 | 19. | 18 | 11.14 | 23.50 | 15.83 | 19 | 12.91 | 17.03 | 21.44 | 24. | 12.10 | 24.58 | 32.73 | 27.31 | 19.40 | . 58 |  |

 VIE $=$ Viet Nam.
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## Appendix 6: 2017 International Comparison Program: <br> Structure of Gross Domestic Product and Changes in the ICP Classification

Table A6: Structure of Gross Domestic Product, Asia and the Pacific, 2017

| Category | Components | Number of Basic Headings | Number of Products | Share in GDP <br> (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross Domestic Product | A, B, C, D, E | 155 | 1,175 | 100.0 |
| A. Actual final consumption by households | A1, A2 | 136 | 901 | 53.0 |
| A1. Individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) and nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH) | A1.a-A1.h | 115 | 887 | 45.4 |
| A1.a. Food and non-alcoholic beverages |  | 29 | 251 | 10.6 |
| A1.b. Clothing and footwear |  | 5 | 82 | 2.5 |
| A1.c. Housing, water, electricity, gas and other fuels |  | 9 | 17 | 7.2 |
| A1.d. Health and education ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | 10 | 181 | 5.2 |
| A1.e. Transportation and communication |  | 16 | 106 | 6.7 |
| A1.f. Recreation and culture |  | 14 | 60 | 2.0 |
| A1.g. Restaurants and hotels |  | 2 | 21 | 2.3 |
| A1.h. Other consumption expenditure items |  | 30 | 169 | 8.9 |
| A2. Individual consumption expenditure by government |  | 21 | 14 | 7.6 |
| B. Collective consumption expenditure by government |  | 5 | 20 | 6.6 |
| C. Gross fixed capital formation |  | 10 | 254 | 36.9 |
| D. Changes in inventories and net acquisitions of valuables |  | 2 | b | 2.0 |
| E. Balance of exports and imports |  | 2 | b | 1.6 |
| GDP = gross domestic product, ICP = International Comparison <br> Notes: Share in region's GDP is based on exchange rate converte rounding. <br> a Includes split items for pharmaceutical products. <br> b Reference purchasing power parities, listed in Appendix 7, wer <br> Source: Asian Development Bank estimates. | ram. <br> Pestimates of $22 p$ <br> d. | ipating economies | omponents may not add | total due to |

Figure A6.1: Changes in Classification from 2011 to 2017 International Comparison Program

| 2011 ICP Classification |  |  | 2017 ICP Revised Classification |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Headings | Level | Code | Headings | Level |
| 110117 | Vegetables | Class | 1101170 | Vegetables | Class |
| 1101171 | Fresh or chilled vegetables other than potatoes | Basic Heading | 1101171 | Fresh or chilled vegetables, other than potatoes and other tuber vegetables | Basic Heading |
| 1101172 | Fresh or chilled potatoes | Basic Heading | 1101172 | Fresh or chilled potatoes and other tuber vegetables | Basic Heading |
| 110400 | HOUSING, WATER, ELECTRICITY, GAS, AND OTHER FUELS | Category | 1104000 | HOUSING, WATER, ELECTRICITY, GAS AND OTHER FUELS | Category |
| 110410 | ACTUAL AND IMPUTED RENTALS FOR HOUSING | Group | 1104100 | ACTUAL RENTALS FOR HOUSING | Group |
| 110411 | Actual and imputed rentals for housing | Class | 1104110 | Actual rentals for housing | Class |
| 1104111 | Actual and imputed rentals for housing | Basic Heading | 1104111 | Actual rentals for housing | Basic Heading |
|  |  |  | 1104200 | IMPUTED RENTALS FOR HOUSING | Group |
|  |  |  | 1104210 | Imputed rentals for housing | Class |
|  |  |  | 1104211 | Imputed rentals for housing | Basic Heading |
| 111300 | BALANCE OF EXPENDITURES OF RESIDENTS ABROAD AND EXPENDITURES OF NON-RESIDENTS IN THE ECONOMIC TERRITORY | Category | 1113000 | NET PURCHASES ABROAD | Category |
| 111310 | BALANCE OF EXPENDITURES OF RESIDENTS ABROAD AND EXPENDITURES OF NON-RESIDENTS IN THE ECONOMIC TERRITORY | Group | 1113100 | NET PURCHASES ABROAD | Group |
| 111311 | Balance of expenditures of residents abroad and expenditures of non-residents in the economic territory | Class | 1113110 | Net purchases abroad | Class |
| 1113111 | Final consumption expenditure of resident households in the rest of the world | Basic Heading | 1113111 | Net purchases abroad | Basic Heading |
| 1113112 | Final consumption expenditure of non-resident households in the economic territory | Basic Heading |  |  |  |
| 120000 | INDIVIDUAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE BY NPISHS | Main Aggregate | 1200000 | INDIVIDUAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE BYNPISHs | Main Aggregate |
| 120100 | INDIVIDUAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE BY NPISHS | Category | 1201000 | HOUSING | Category |
| 120110 | INDIVIDUAL CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE BY NPISHS | Group | 1201100 | HOUSING | Group |
| 120111 | Individual consumption expenditure by NPISHs | Class | 1201110 | Housing | Class |
| 1201111 | Individual consumption expenditure by NPISHs | Basic Heading | 1201111 | Housing | Basic Heading |
|  |  |  | 1202000 | HEALTH | Category |
|  |  |  | 1202100 | HEALTH | Group |
|  |  |  | 1202110 | Health | Class |
|  |  |  | 1202111 | Health | Basic Heading |
|  |  |  | 1203000 | RECREATION AND CULTURE | Category |
|  |  |  | 1203100 | RECREATION AND CULTURE | Group |
|  |  |  | 1203110 | Recreation and culture | Class |
|  |  |  | 1203111 | Recreation and culture | Basic Heading |
|  |  |  | 1204000 | EDUCATION | Category |
|  |  |  | 1204100 | EDUCATION | Group |
|  |  |  | 1204110 | Education | Class |
|  |  |  | 1204111 | Education | Basic Heading |
|  |  |  | 1205000 | SOCIAL PROTECTION AND OTHER SERVICES | Category |
|  |  |  | 1205100 | SOCIAL PROTECTION AND OTHER SERVICES | Group |
|  |  |  | 1205110 | Social protection and other services | Class |
|  |  |  | 1205111 | Social protection and other services | Basic Heading |
|  |  |  | 1500000 | GROSS CAPITAL FORMATION | Main Aggregate |
| 150000 | GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION | Main Aggregate | 1501000 | GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION | Category |
| 150100 | MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT | Category | 1501100 | MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT | Group |
| 150110 | METAL PRODUCTS AND EQUIPMENT | Group | 1501110 | Metal products and equipment | Class |
| 150111 | Fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment | Class |  |  |  |
| 1501111 | Fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment | Basic Heading | 1501111 | Fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment - formerly 1501111 | Basic Heading |
| 150112 | General purpose machinery | Class | 1501112 | Electrical and optical equipment - formerly 1501141 | Basic Heading |
| 1501121 | General purpose machinery | Basic Heading | 1501115 | General purpose machinery - formerly 1501121 | Basic Heading |
| 150113 | Special purpose machinery | Class | 1501116 | Special purpose machinery - formerly 1501131 | Basic Heading |
| 1501131 | Special purpose machinery | Basic Heading |  |  |  |
| 150114 | Electrical and optical equipment | Class |  |  |  |
| 1501141 | Electrical and optical equipment | Basic Heading |  |  |  |
| 150115 | Other manufactured goods n.e.c. | Class |  |  |  |
| 1501151 | Other manufactured goods n.e.c. | Basic Heading |  |  |  |
| 150120 | TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT | Group |  |  |  |
| 150121 | Road transport equipment | Class | 1501120 | Transport equipment | Class |
| 1501211 | Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | Basic Heading | 1501121 | Road transport equipment - formerly 1501211 and 1501212 | Basic Heading |
| 1501212 | Other road transport | Basic Heading |  |  |  |
| 150122 | Other transport equipment | Class |  |  |  |
| 1501221 | Other transport equipment | Basic Heading | 1501122 | Other transport equipment - formerly 1501221 | Basic Heading |
| 150300 | OTHER PRODUCTS | Category |  |  |  |
| 150310 | OTHER PRODUCTS | Group | 1501300 | OTHER PRODUCTS | Group |
| 150311 | Other products | Class | 1501310 | Other products | Class |
| 1503111 | Other products | Basic Heading | 1501311 | Other products - formerly 1501151 and 1503111 | Basic Heading |

ICP = International Comparison Program, n.e.c. $=$ not elsewhere classified; NPISH $=$ nonprofit institutions serving households.
Source: World Bank. 2016b. International Comparison Program: Classification of Final Expenditure on GDP. Washington, DC. http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/708531575560035925/pdf/ICP-
Classification-description-2019-1205.pdf.

Figure A6.2: Changes in the Descriptions in the Headings of International Comparison Program Classification from 2011 to 2017

| 2011 ICP Classification |  |  | 2017 ICP Revised Classification |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Headings | Level | Code | Headings | Level |
| 1101115 | Pasta products | Basic Heading | 1101115 | Pasta products and couscous | Basic Heading |
| 1101143 | Cheese | Basic Heading | 1101143 | Cheese and curd | Basic Heading |
| 110200 | ALCOHOL BEVERAGES, TOBACCO AND NARCOTICS | Category | 1102000 | ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES, TOBACCO AND NARCOTICS | Category |
| 110210 | ALCOHOL BEVERAGES | Group | 1102100 | ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES | Group |
| 110500 | FURNISHING, HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT AND ROUTINE MAINTENANCE OF THE HOUSE | Category | 1105000 | FURNISHINGS, HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT AND ROUTINE HOUSEHOLD MAINTENANCE | Category |
| 111230 | PERSONAL EFFECTS | Group | 1112300 | PERSONAL EFFECTS N.E.C. | Group |
| 111260 | FINANCIAL SERVICES | Group | 1112600 | FINANCIAL SERVICES N.E.C. | Group |
| 111262 | Other financial services | Class | 1112620 | Other financial services n.e.c. | Class |
| 1112621 | Other financial services | Basic Heading | 1112621 | Other financial services n.e.c. | Basic Heading |
| 111270 | OTHER SERVICES | Group | 1112700 | OTHER SERVICES N.E.C. | Group |
| 111271 | Other services n.e.c. | Class | 1112710 | Other services n.e.c. | Class |
| 1112711 | Other services n.e.c. | Basic Heading | 1112711 | Other services n.e.c. | Basic Heading |
| 111300 | BALANCE OF EXPENDITURES OF RESIDENTS ABROAD AND EXPENDITURES OF NON-RESIDENTS IN THE ECONOMIC TERRITORY | Category | 1113000 | NET PURCHASES ABROAD | Category |
| 111310 | BALANCE OF EXPENDITURES OF RESIDENTS ABROAD AND EXPENDITURES OF NON-RESIDENTS IN THE ECONOMIC TERRITORY | Group | 1113100 | NET PURCHASES ABROAD | Group |
| 111311 | Balance of expenditures of residents abroad and expenditures of non-residents in the economic territory | Class | 1113110 | Net purchases abroad | Class |

n.e.c. $=$ not elsewhere classified.

Note: The red-highlighted text reflects the changes in the ICP classification.
Source: World Bank. 2016b. International Comparison Program: Classification of Final Expenditure on GDP. Washington, DC. http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/708531575560035925/pdf/
ICP-Classification-description-2019-1205.pdf.

## Appendix 7: List of Reference Purchasing Power Parities

| 2011 International Comparison Program |  |  | 2017 International Comparison Program ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Description | Reference | Code | Description | Reference |
| 1102311 | Narcotics | Tobacco | 1102311 | Narcotics | Tobacco |
| 1104111 | Actual and imputed rentals for housing | Volume relatives of individual consumption expenditures by households | 1104A | Actual and imputed rentals for housing | Volume relatives of individual consumption expenditures by households |
| 1104421 | Miscellaneous services relating to the dwelling | Maintenance and repair of dwelling water supply | 1104421 | Miscellaneous services relating to the dwelling | Maintenance and repair of dwelling water supply |
| 1105131 | Repair of furniture, furnishings and floor coverings | Maintenance and repair of dwelling | 1105131 | Repair of furniture, furnishings and floor coverings | Maintenance and repair of dwelling |
| 1105331 | Repair of household appliances | Maintenance and repair of dwelling | 1105331 | Repair of household appliances | Maintenance and repair of dwelling |
| 1105511 | Major tools and equipment | Major household appliances whether electric or not small electric household appliances small tools and miscellaneous accessories | 1105511 | Major tools and equipment | Not a reference BH in 2017 ICP |
| 1105622 | Household services | Maintenance and repair of dwelling | 1105622 | Household services | Not a reference BH in 2017 ICP |
| 1106311 | Hospital services | Medical services dental services paramedical services | 1106311 | Hospital services | Medical services dental services paramedical services |
| 1107121 | Motor cycles | Motor cars | 1107121 | Motor cycles | Not a reference BH in 2017 ICP |
| 1107141 | Animal drawn vehicles | Bicycles | 1107141 | Animal drawn vehicles | Bicycles |
| 1107341 | Passenger transport by sea and inland waterway | Passenger transport by railway passenger transport by road passenger transport by air | 1107341 | Passenger transport by sea and inland waterway | Not a reference BH in 2017 ICP |
| 1107351 | Combined passenger transport | Fuels and lubricants for personal transport equipment maintenance and repair of personal transport equipment other services in respect of personal transport equipment passenger transport by railway passenger transport by road passenger transport by air | 1107351 | Combined passenger transport | Fuels and lubricants for personal transport equipment maintenance and repair of personal transport equipment other services in respect of personal transport equipment passenger transport by railway passenger transport by road passenger transport by air passenger transport by sea and inland waterway |
| 1107361 | Other purchased transport services | Fuels and lubricants for personal transport equipment maintenance and repair of personal transport equipment other services in respect of personal transport equipment passenger transport by railway passenger transport by road passenger transport by air | 1107361 | Other purchased transport services | Not a reference BH in 2017 ICP |
| 1109211 | Major durables for outdoor and indoor recreation | Bicycles audio-visual, photographic and information processing equipment recording media | 1109211 | Major durables for outdoor and indoor recreation | Bicycles <br> audio-visual, photographic and information processing equipment recording media repair of audio-visual, photographic and information processing equipment |
| 1109231 | Maintenance and repair of other major durables for recreation and culture | PPPs for maintenance and repair of the dwelling; and audio-visual, photographic and information processing equipment | 1109231 | Maintenance and repair of other major durables for recreation and culture | Maintenance and repair of personal transport equipment repair of audio-visual, photographic and information processing equipment |
| 1109331 | Gardens and pets | PPPs for ICEH on the domestic market (excluding reference PPPs basic headings) | 1109331 | Gardens and pets | Not a reference BH in 2017 ICP |
| 1109351 | Veterinary and other services for pets | Weighted PPPs for ICEH on the domestic market (excluding reference PPPs basic headings) | 1109351 | Veterinary and other services for pets | Not a reference BH in 2017 ICP |
| 1109431 | Games of chance | PPP for recreational and sporting services | 1109431 | Games of chance | Recreational and sporting services |
| 1112211 | Prostitution | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BHs and $\mathrm{BH} s$ with reference PPPs | 1112211 | Prostitution | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BH and BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1112411 | Social protection | Compensation of employees from health and education services | 1112411 | Social protection | Compensation of employees from health and education services |
| 1112511 | Insurance | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BHs and $\mathrm{BH} s$ with reference PPPs | 1112511 | Insurance | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BH and BH s with reference PPPs |
| 1112611 | Financial intermediation services indirectly measured (FISIM) | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BHs and $\mathrm{BH} s$ with reference PPPs | 1112611 | Financial intermediation services indirectly measured (FISIM) | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BH and BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1112621 | Other financial services, n.e.c. | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BHs and $\mathrm{BH} s$ with reference PPPs | 1112621 | Other financial services n.e.c. | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BH and BH s with reference PPPs |
| 1112711 | Other services n.e.c. | PPPs for ICEH on the domestic market (excluding health and education basic headings and reference PPPs basic headings) | 1112711 | Other services n.e.c. | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding health and education BHs and BH s with reference PPPs |
| 1113111 | Net purchases abroad | Exchange rates | 1113111 | Net purchases abroad | Exchange rates |

## Appendix 7: List of Reference Purchasing Power Parities contined

| 2011 International Comparison Program |  |  | 2017 International Comparison Program ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Code | Description | Reference | Code | Description | Reference |
| 1201111 | Housing NPISH | Actual and imputed rentals for housing | 1201111 | Housing NPISH | Actual and imputed rentals for housing |
| 1202111 | Health - NPISH | Compensation of employees from production of health services | 1202111 | Health - NPISH | Compensation of employees from production of health services |
| 1203111 | Recreation and culture NPISH | Cultural services <br> Recreational and sporting services | 1203111 | Recreation and culture NPISH | Cultural services <br> Recreational and sporting services |
| 1204111 | Education - NPISH | Compensation of employees from production of education services | 1204111 | Education - NPISH | Compensation of employees from production of education services |
| 1205111 | Social protection and other services - NPISH | Compensation of employees from production of health and education services | 1205111 | Social protection and other services - NPISH | Compensation of employees from production of health and education services |
| 1301111 | Housing | Actual and imputed rents | 1301111 | Housing | Actual and imputed rents |
| 1302111 | Pharmaceutical products | Pharmaceutical products (HHC) | 1302111 | Pharmaceutical products | Pharmaceutical products (HHC) |
| 1302112 | Other medical products | Other medical products (HHC) | 1302112 | Other medical products | Other medical products (HHC) |
| 1302113 | Therapeutic appliances and equipment | Therapeutic appliances and equipment (HHC) | 1302113 | Therapeutic appliances and equipment | Therapeutic appliances and equipment (HHC) |
| 1302121 | Outpatient medical services | Medical services (HHC) | 1302121 | Out-patient medical services | Medical services (HHC) |
| 1302122 | Outpatient dental services | Dental services (HHC) | 1302122 | Out-patient dental services | Dental services (HHC) |
| 1302123 | Outpatient paramedical services | Paramedical services (HHC) | 1302123 | Out-patient paramedical services | Paramedical services (HHC) |
| 1302124 | Hospital services | Hospital services (HHC) | 1302124 | Hospital services | Hospital services (HHC) |
| 1302221 | Intermediate consumption | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs | 1302221 | Intermediate consumption | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1302231 | Gross operating surplus | PPP for gross fixed capital formation (150000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs | 1302231 | Gross operating surplus | PPP for gross fixed capital formation (150000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1302241 | Net taxes on production | Compensation of employees from production of health services | 1302241 | Net taxes on production | Compensation of employees from Production of Health services |
| 1302251 | Receipts from sales: health services | Compensation of employees from production of health services | 1302251 | Receipts from sales | Compensation of employees from production of health services |
| 1303111 | Recreation and culture | Cultural services <br> Recreational and sporting services | 1303111 | Recreation and culture | Cultural services <br> Recreational and sporting services |
| 1304111 | Education benefits and reimbursements | Education (1110000) | 1304111 | Education benefits and reimbursements | Education (1110000) |
| 1304221 | Intermediate consumption | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs | 1304221 | Intermediate consumption | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1304231 | Gross operating surplus | PPP for gross fixed capital formation (150000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs | 1304231 | Gross operating surplus | PPP for gross fixed capital formation (150000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1304241 | Net taxes on production | Compensation of employees from production of education services | 1304241 | Net taxes on production | Compensation of employees from production of education services |
| 1304251 | Receipt from sales: education | Compensation of employees from production of education services | 1304251 | Receipt from sales | Compensation of employees from production of education services |
| 1305111 | Social protection | Compensation of employees from production of health and education services | 1305111 | Social protection | Compensation of employees from production of health and education services |
| 1401121 | Intermediate consumption | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs | 1401121 | Intermediate consumption | PPP for individual consumption expenditure by households (110000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1401131 | Gross operating surplus | PPP for gross fixed capital formation (150000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs | 1401131 | Gross operating surplus | PPP for gross fixed capital formation (150000), excluding BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1401141 | Net taxes on production | Compensation of employees from production of collective services | 1401141 | Net taxes on production | Compensation of employees from production of collective services |
| 1401151 | Receipts from sales: collective services | Compensation of employees from production of collective services | 1401151 | Receipts from sales | Compensation of employees from production of collective services |
| 1501122 | Other transport equipment | Road transport equipment | 1501122 | Other transport equipment | Road transport equipment |
| 1501311 | Other products | Electrical and optical equipment General purpose machinery Special purpose machinery Road transport equipment | 1501311 | Other products | Electrical and optical equipment <br> General purpose machinery <br> Special purpose machinery <br> Road transport equipment |
| 1502111 | Change in inventories | Referenced to BHs classified as containing predominantly goods, excluding BHs with reference PPPs | 1502111 | Change in inventories | Referenced to BHs classified as containing predominantly goods, excluding BHs with reference PPPs |
| 1503111 | Acquisitions less disposals of valuables | Exchange rates | 1503111 | Acquisitions less disposals of valuables | Exchange rates |
| 1601111 | Exports of goods and services | Exchange rates | 1601111 | Exports of goods and services | Exchange rates |
| 1601112 | Imports of goods and services | Exchange rates | 1601112 | Imports of goods and services | Exchange rates |

## Appendix Table 8: Scope and Coverage of Main Gross Domestic Product Aggregates-2011 and 2017 Cycles

| Aggregate | 2011 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Individual consumption <br> expenditure by households | Collected price for 923 items in the Asia and Pacific list. The 2011 ICP list <br> was taken from the 2005 and 2009 product lists which were updated for <br> obsolescence and supplemented with poverty-specific items. |
|  | Collected monthly and quarterly prices for most items but collected more <br> frequently for some products (e.g., weekly for fruits and vegetables). Collected <br> bi-annual or annually prices of less volatile items, such as utilities. |
|  | Nationwide price collection |
| Government final <br> consumption expenditure | Collected average compensation for 44 government posts; 38 items included <br> Regional Advisory Board. |
| Gross fixed capital <br> formation in construction | Collected prices for 46 global input items relevant to the Asia and Pacific <br> region, and used relevance indicators. Used reference PPPs from aggregate <br> machinery and equipment for PPPs for rental of equipment. |
| Gross fixed capital <br> formation in machinery and <br> equipment | Collected prices for 177 global items relevant to the Asia and Pacific region. |
| Change in inventories and <br> net acquisitions of valuables | Referenced from PPPs for durable and non-durable goods, and gross fixed <br> capital formation (excluding reference PPPs basic headings). |

Collected 887 items in the Asia Pacific list. The 2017 ICP list was prepared based on the 2011 ICP list, with some obsolete items dropped and new items added using the information gathered from the 2016 PPP Update exercise and the global core list.
Collected monthly, quarterly, semi-annual and annual prices depending on the volatility of the item, with some economies even collected weekly prices for fruits and vegetables and fresh meat products.

## Nationwide price collection

Collected annual average compensation for 35 occupations in the government, mainly coming from the ICP Global Office, with one additional occupation priced only in Asia and the Pacific.

Collected annual average prices for 58 construction inputs, equipment and labor; regional relevance indicators and resource mixes coming from inputs from economies.

Collected annual average prices for 196 machinery and equipment including other products.

Referenced from PPPs for consumer goods and investment goods (excluding reference PPP basic headings.

ICP = International Comparison Program, PPP = purchasing power parity.
Source: 2017 and 2011 ICP for Asia and the Pacific.

Glossary
$\left.\left.\begin{array}{l|l}\hline \text { Term } & \text { Definition } \\ \hline \text { Actual individual consumption by } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Total value of household final consumption expenditure, including expenditures by nonprofit } \\ \text { institutions serving households (NPISHs) and by government on services provided to } \\ \text { households. }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Additivity } & \begin{array}{l}\text { The concept that the real expenditures for higher-level aggregates can be obtained simply } \\ \text { by adding the real expenditures of the sub-aggregates of which they are composed. Real }\end{array} \\ \text { expenditures obtained using the Gini-Ėltetö-Köves-Szulc (GEKS)-based purchasing power parities } \\ \text { (PPPs) are not additive, so the sum of the real expenditures for the components of gross domestic } \\ \text { product (GDP) does not equal the real expenditure on GDP. }\end{array} \right\rvert\, \begin{array}{lll}\text { The property whereby the relativities between the PPPs, price level indexes (PLIs), and }\end{array}\right\}$

## Glossary

| Term | Definition |
| :---: | :---: |
| Collective consumption expenditure by government | A service provided by general government simultaneously to all members of the community or to all members of a particular section of the community, such as all households living in a particular region. |
| Comparability | A requirement for economies to price products that are identical or, if not identical, equivalent. Pricing comparable products ensures that differences in prices between economies for a product reflect actual price differences and are not influenced by differences in quality. Two, or more, products are said to be comparable either if their physical and economic characteristics are identical, or if they are sufficiently similar that consumers are indifferent between them. |
| Comparison-resistant | A term first used to describe nonmarket services that are difficult to compare across economies because (i) they have no economically significant prices with which to value outputs; (ii) their units of output cannot be otherwise defined and measured, or the institutional arrangements for their provision and the conditions of payment differ from economy to economy; and (iii) their quality varies between economies but the differences cannot be identified and quantified. Increasingly, the term is being used to describe capital goods and many market services whose complexity, variation, and economy specificity make it difficult for them to be priced comparably across economies. |
| Compensation of employees | The total remuneration, in cash or in kind, payable by enterprises to employees in return for work done by the employees during the accounting period. |
| Consumer price index (CPI) | An index of price changes within an economy across time. |
| Dwellings | Buildings that are used entirely or primarily as residences, including any associated structures, such as garages, and all permanent fixtures customarily installed in residences. Movable structures, such as caravans, used as principal residences of households are included. |
| Expenditures | The values of the amounts that buyers pay, or agree to pay, to sellers in exchange for goods or services that sellers provide to them or to other institutional units designated by the buyers. |
| Final consumption | Goods and services used up by individual households or the community to satisfy their individual or collective needs or wants. |
| Fixity | The principle that the PPPs between economies in a region (and therefore the volume relativities based on the PPPs) do not change when the results from that region are combined with those from another region (or regions). |
| Gini-Èltetö-Köves-Szulc (GEKS) method | A procedure that enables binary PPPs, which are nontransitive when more than two economies are involved in the comparison, to be transformed into transitive PPPs, so that comparisons made between any pair of economies are mutually consistent. The GEKS method produces transitive PPPs that are as close as possible to the nontransitive PPPs originally calculated in the binary comparisons. In practice, the GEKS method is relevant only to the second part of this process (i.e., making the PPPs transitive). Real expenditures obtained using GEKS-based PPPs are not additive, so the sum of the real expenditures for the components of GDP does not equal the real expenditure on GDP. |

Glossary

| Term | Definition |
| :---: | :---: |
| government final consumption expenditure (GFCE) | Final consumption expenditure by government consisting of expenditure, including imputed expenditure, incurred by general government on both individual consumption goods and services and on collective consumption services. |
| Gross capital formation (GCF) | Measures the total value of gross fixed capital formation, changes in inventories, and acquisitions less disposals of valuables for a unit or sector. |
| Gross domestic productexpenditure based | Total final expenditures at purchasers' prices (including the free-on-board value of exports of goods and services), less the free-on-board value of imports of goods and services. |
| Gross fixed capital formation (GFCF) | Measures the total value of a producer's acquisitions, less disposals, of fixed assets during the accounting period. It includes certain additions to the value of non-produced assets (such as subsoil assets or major improvements in the quantity, quality, or productivity of land) realized by the productive activity of institutional units. |
| Household products | Refer to the consumption of households for the following components: <br> - Food and non-alcoholic beverages <br> - Alcoholic beverages, tobacco and narcotics <br> - Clothing and footwear <br> - Housing, water, electricity, gas, and other fuels <br> - Furnishings, household equipment, and routine maintenance of the house <br> - Health <br> - Transport <br> - Communication <br> - Recreation and culture <br> - Education <br> - Restaurant and hotels <br> - Miscellaneous goods and services (personal grooming, personal care, personal effects, financial services, and other services). |
| Individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) | Final consumption expenditure by households, consisting of the expenditure, including imputed expenditure, incurred by resident households on individual consumption goods and services, including those sold at prices that are not economically significant; also includes the individual consumption expenditure by NPISHs, in the context of the 2017 ICP in Asia and the Pacific. |
| Local currency unit (LCU) | The monetary unit in which economic values are expressed in an economy. Also known as the national currency unit. |
| Lorenz curve | Developed by Max Lorenz in 1905, it is a graphical representation of the distribution of income or wealth. The horizontal axis of the graph represents the percentiles of population, while the vertical axis represents the cumulative income or wealth. |
| Multilateral comparison | A simultaneous price or volume comparison of more than two economies that produces consistent relations among all pairs of economies-that is, one that satisfies the transitivity requirement. |

[^42]
## Glossary

| Term | Definition |
| :--- | :--- |
| Resident | An institutional unit is resident in an economy when it has a center of economic interest in <br> the economic territory. |
| Rest of the world | The rest of the world consists of all nonresident institutional units that enter into transactions <br> with resident units, or that have other economic links with resident units. |
| Structured product descriptions | Generic descriptions that list the characteristics relevant to a particular narrow cluster of <br> products. |
| System of National Accounts | Consists of a coherent, consistent, and integrated set of macroeconomic accounts, <br> balance sheets, and tables based on a set of internationally agreed concepts, definitions, <br> classifications, and accounting rules (United Nations 2009). |
| Transitivity | The property whereby the direct PPP between any two economies (or regions) yields the <br> same result as an indirect comparison via a third economy (or region). It is sometimes referred <br> to as "circularity." |
| Solume "Real expenditure." |  |
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[^0]:    1 The World Health Organization and United Nations Children's Fund Joint Monitoring Programme is the custodian of global data on water supply, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH).

[^1]:    2 Dikhanov tables compare average prices of the same item across different economies in order to screen average national prices for possible errors (for further detals, see Appendix 1).

[^2]:    3 The PPP applies to India as a whole; in specific locations within India, price levels may be much higher or lower than the national price levels that the ICP measures.

[^3]:    HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar, PPP = purchasing power parity, RM = Malaysian ringgit. Sources: The Economist. 2020. Burgernomics - The Big Mac Index. https://www.economist.com/news/2020/01/15/the-big-mac-index (accessed 4 March 2020) and Asian Development Bank estimates (Big Mac prices as of 14 January 2020).

[^4]:    4 The methods employed are such that price comparisons between different economies are not affected by the choice of the base economy.

[^5]:    5 For a comprehensive review of the uses of PPPs at the national and international level the reader may consult Ward (2009), Silver (2013), Inklaar and Timmer (2013b) and Hamadeh and Abu Shanab (2016).
    6 Basic headings are the lowest level of aggregation of items in the GDP breakdown for which expenditure data are to be compiled. For example, prices will be collected for 20 varieties of rice, and the expenditures across all rice varieties will be aggregated under the basic heading "rice."

[^6]:    7 A related concept of interest is the real exchange rate which is closely aligned with the notion of price level index (PLI) discussed in this chapter.

[^7]:    8 There are aggregation methods like the Geary-Khamis method, which produce international comparisons that are additive but suffer from other deficiencies. See Diewert (2013) for a discussion of the additivity property and related issues.

[^8]:    9 The regional population is based on population mid-year estimates supplied to ADB by the participatingeconomies for the 2017 ICP; the world population is from the World Development Indicators database. World Bank. World Development Indicators. https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators (accessed 18 March 2020).
    10 The economy-level growth rates presented here are simple average of annual GDP growth rates calculated from data in Key Indicators Database. Asian Development Bank. https://kidb.adb.org/kidb/ (accessed 16 March 2020) and World Development Indicators database. World Bank. World Development Indicators. https:// databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators (accessed 27 March 2020).

[^9]:    11 The methodology used in the ICP ensures that results presented are invariant to the choice of the reference currency: the relative levels of real GDP would remain the same even if other economies or currencies are used as the base or reference economy.

[^10]:    n.a. = not applicable; HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar; HKG = Hong Kong, China; LCU = local currency unit; PLI = price level index; PPP = purchasing power parity; XR = exchange rate.

[^11]:    12 The axis in $\log$ scale provides less clustered visualization for situations where the majority of the data points are concentrated in the lower range, while a very few data points are exponentially higher than the rest. This is achieved by making each fixed interval of the axis to represent an exponentially increasing value, e.g., $10,100,1,000,10,000100,000,1,000,000$, and so on.
    13 The fitted line is based on semi-log specification, i.e., the PLI is regressed on natural log of per capita real GDP.

[^12]:    n.a. = not applicable; HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar; HKG = Hong Kong, China; LCU = local currency unit; PLI = price level index; PPP = purchasing power parity; XR = exchange rate.

[^13]:    

[^14]:    BAN = Bangladesh; BHU = Bhutan; BRU = Brunei Darussalam; CAM = Cambodia; FIJ = Fiji; HKG = Hong Kong, China; IND = India; INO = Indonesia; LAO = Lao People's Democratic Republic; MAL = Malaysia; MLD = Maldives; MON = Mongolia; MYA = Myanmar; NEP = Nepal; PAK = Pakistan; PHI = Philippines; PRC = People's Republic of China; SIN = Singapore; SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei,China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam. Note: In this figure, individual consumption expenditure by households (ICEH) includes expenditures by nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH).
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^15]:    AICH = actual individual consumption by households, GDP = gross domestic product, HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^16]:    14 A degree of caution needs to be exercised here as these aggregates are not additive; the sum of components of GDP in real terms do not add up to real GDP.

[^17]:    ADB = Asian Development Bank; GDP = gross domestic product; HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar; HKG = Hong Kong, China; LCU = local currency unit.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^18]:    $\mathrm{AICH}=$ actual individual consumption expenditure by households, GDP = gross domestic product, GFCE = government final consumption expenditure, GFCF = gross fixed capital formation, ICEH = individual consumption expenditure by households, NPISH = nonprofit institutions serving households, PRC= People's Republic of China.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^19]:    $\mathrm{AICH}=$ actual individual consumption expenditure by households, GDP = gross domestic product, GFCE $=$ government final consumption expenditure, GFCF = gross fixed capital formation, HK\$ = Hong Kong dollar, ICEH = individual consumption expenditure by households, Lao PDR = Lao People's Democratic Republic, NPISH = nonprofit institutions serving households, PRC = People's Republic of China.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^20]:    15 In Figure 6.3, ICEH includes expenditures by nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH).

[^21]:    1 Section A1.6 describes the process used by the ICP Global Office in linking regional comparisons leading to global comparisons.

[^22]:    NPISH = nonprofit institutions serving households.
    Source: Asian Development Bank based on World Bank. 2016b. International Comparison Program: Classification of Final Expenditure on GDP. Washington, DC. http:// pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/708531575560035925/pdf/ICP-Classification-description-2019-1205.pdf.

[^23]:    2 The model as specified suffers from perfect multicollinearity and therefore can be estimated only after imposing restriction on one of the parameters.
    3 Connectivity here simply means that price data are such that it is not possible to group the economies into two sets such that no item priced in one set of economies is priced in the other. In such cases, there is no basis for making price comparisons.

[^24]:    4 Since GDP is known, if expenditure shares are known then expenditure associated with each basic heading can be computed. Similarly, if expenditure for each basic heading is given, shares can be computed.

[^25]:    5 The Cobb-Douglas production function reflects the relationship between the output produced and the corresponding inputs: physical capital and labor. 6 While this is essentially the method used in 2011, the actual implementation was slightly more complicated.
    7 Macau, China participated in the 2011 cycle of the ICP but not the 2017 cycle.

[^26]:    8 Slightly different procedures are used for these aggregates since the Eurostat-OECD economies' procedure are different from those used in other regions. Details can be obtained from the final report for the 2011 ICP cycle (World Bank 2015).

[^27]:    Source: 2017 International Comparison Program for Asia and the Pacific.

[^28]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^29]:     Democratic Republic; MAL = Malaysia; MLD = Maldives, MON $=$ Mong
    SRI $=$ Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei, China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.

    Note: Each real aggregate value is derived by using a purchasing power parity that is specific to that aggregate, so real aggregates may not sum up to the total of their real components for an economy. a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government. Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^30]:    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^31]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government. Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^32]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^33]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^34]:     SIN = Singapore; SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei,China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam
    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^35]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households，nonprofit institutions serving households，and government．
    Source：Asian Development Bank estimates．

[^36]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^37]:    Restaurants and hotels

[^38]:     SIN = Singapore; SRI = Sri Lanka; TAP = Taipei,China; THA = Thailand; VIE = Viet Nam.

    Note: Each real aggregate value is derived by using a purchasing power parity that is specific to that aggregate, so real aggregates may not sum up to the total of their real components for an economy. a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.

[^39]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^40]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households，nonprofit institutions serving households，and government．
    Source：Asian Development Bank estimates．

[^41]:    a Includes individual consumption expenditure by households, nonprofit institutions serving households, and government.
    Source: Asian Development Bank estimates.

[^42]:    Glossary

    | Term | Definition |
    | :--- | :--- |
    | National annual average price | A price that has been averaged over all localities of an economy to account for regional <br> variations in prices and over the days, weeks, months, or quarters of the reference year <br> to allow for seasonal variations in prices, as well as general inflation and changes in price <br> structures. |
    | Net purchases abroad | Purchases by residential households in the rest of the world (astourists, travelling businessmen <br> and government officials, crews, border and seasonal workers, diplomatic and military <br> personal stationed abroad), less purchases by non-residential households in the economic <br> territory of the country (as tourists, travelling businessmen, and government officials, crews, <br> border and seasonal workers, diplomatic and military personal stationed abroad). |
    | An institutional unit is resident in an economy when it has a center of economic interest in |  |
    | the economic territory. |  | | Nonprofither institutions that are not predominantly financed and controlled by government |
    | :--- |

