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The cost of sending remittances to and within Africa are the highest in the world

11% average intra-Africa corridors

Range of 1% to 29% in intra-Africa corridors

Source: FSDA (2017); World Bank (2017)
Following an initial decrease, the price of remittances has not changed over the last three years.
The real cost for consumers in Africa remains even higher.

In Malawi, the cost of using a bank account is 17% of the average monthly income of adults.

- Basic account cost: USD0.65
- Travel cost: USD3.84
- Opportunity cost: USD1.07

Cost to access bank (88%) = Bank fees (12%)
Market realities make it hard to further reduce prices with existing approaches

- High variation in infrastructure and regulatory frameworks to support affordable national and cross-border low-value, high-volume payments
- Consumer dependency on and preference for cash-based payment services limiting the uptake of digital solutions
- High levels and increasing sophistication of informal over-distance payments, meeting consumer needs better
- Disproportionate KYC documentation required for cross-border remittance services reduces formal flows
New approaches required to bring down the cost of remittances without driving exclusion

- Reducing the barriers for adopting and using digital payments solutions over cash and informal services by changing the environment/context in which they exist
  - Regional payment systems that are interoperable with domestic payment solutions (e.g. hubs, cryptos, protocols) *by proof of concept*
  - Regulatory harmonisation (e.g. BoP reporting and cross-border AML/CFT measures) *by regulatory TA and influencing global FATF/ITU guidelines*

- Increasing the scale of formal remittances by working with existing cash-based payments behaviour
  - Full supply value chain digitisation to incentivise consumer/merchant uptake of digital solutions *by understanding cash reticulation systems and the role of technology*
  - Formalising consumers through the application of technology in identity (e.g. biometrics) and special-purpose vehicles *by understanding remittance sending and receiving behaviour*
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Annex 1: Cash-based OTC transactions dominate in Africa

- Even in the UK, cash still dominates according to new DMA research.
- African countries are largely cash-dominated when it comes to remittances.

Annex 2: Disproportionate regulation drives informality

- Excluded and inconvenienced consumers are forced to access informal financial services.
- Informal systems have competitive advantage – not hamstrung by regulation.
- Through technological innovations, informal financial services can offer high-quality and more efficient services to consumers.

- Disproportionality exacerbates informalisation in the retail sector
- Disproportionality encourages shadow banking in the wholesale sector

Annex 3: High levels of exclusion due to documentation

Financially excluded due to a lack of documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percent Excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep.</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>