ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC
Bangkok

PURCHASING POWER PARITY AND QUANTITY COMPARISON FOR THE ESCAP REGION, 1985

UNITED NATIONS
New York, 1992

ST/ESCAP/1128

FOREWORD

This publication presents the results of the ESCAP regional comparison in phase V of the International Comparison Programme. That programme has 1985 as the reference year. Eleven members and associate members of ESCAP participated in the programme. They are Bangladesh, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Hong Kong.

The ESCAP regional comparison was undertaken with financial support from the Government of Japan, the Asian Development Bank and the United Nations Development Programme. The data inputs for the comparison were the result of the combined efforts of the participating countries. The ESCAP secretariat is grateful to the donors as well as the participating countries for making this publication possible.

The first draft of this publication was presented as a document for discussion at the Asia-Pacific Seminar on the use of Purchasing Power Parities, which was held from 26 to 30 November 1990 at Niigata, Japan, and financed and hosted by the Government of Japan. That draft was prepared by the late Mr. Laszlo Drechsler, who was formerly the chief of the International Price Statistics Section at the United Nations Statistical Office. It has been revised by Mr. Janos Arvay of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office, taking into account comments and decisions taken at the Seminar.

It is hoped that the publication will help promote the use of the results of the International Comparison Programme.

January 1992

CONTENTS

		Paragraph	Page
	FOREWORD		i
I.	INTRODUCTION	1 - 3	1
II.	THE OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPARISON	4 - 12	1
III.	THE METHODOLOGY IN DETAIL	13 - 45	3
A.	Gross domestic product as used for the International Comparison Programme	13 - 15	3
B.	The delineation of household consumption from government consumption ..	16 - 17	3
C.	Breakdown of GDP into analytical categories	18	4
D.	Breakdown of GDP into "basic headings"	19 - 20	4
E.	Selection of price representatives	21 - 31	4
F.	Special cases of the purchasing power comparison	32 - 42	6
G.	The method applied for the aggregation of the basic heading results	43 - 45	9
H.	The selection of the numéraire	46 - 49	9
I.	Linking the results of the ESCAP comparison to the results of other countries participating in phase V in other regions	50 - 54	12
IV.	RESULTS OF THE COMPARISON	55 - 127	13
A.	Level of global and per capita real gross domestic product	55 - 58	13
B.	Differences in per capita real gross domestic product according to its main components	59 - 63	14
C.	Differences in per capita GDP according to analytical categories	64 - 81	16
D.	PPPs and deviations from exchange rates	82 - 104	20
E.	Correlation between the quantity and price structure in the region	105 - 116	26
F.	Nepal in the ESCAP comparison	117 - 121	32
G.	Similarity of the quantity and price structure among ESCAP countries/areas	122 - 127	34
V.	EXTENSION OF THE RESULTS OF THE 1985 ...ESCAP COMPARISON	128 - 140	37
A.	Comparison of ESCAP countries/areas with OECD member countries	129 - 133	37
B.	Comparison of relative per capita GDP level between 1980 and 1985 for seven countries and areas	134 - 137	40
C.	Economic development and changes in prices between 1985 and 1990	138 - 140	41

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Three versions of determining the numéraire for the ESCAP comparison	11
2.	Effects of the different numéraires on the main results of India	11
3.	Total and per capita gross domestic product in 10 ESCAP countries and areas	13
4.	Relative levels of per capita real GDP, all pairs of ESCAP countries and areas	14
5.	Differences in per capita GDP according to the main components	15
6.	Differences in household consumption according to the main groups of goods and services	16
7.	Differences in capital formation according to the main types of goods	19
8.	Purchasing power parities for GDP and exchange rates between currencies of 10 ESCAP countries and areas and the United States	20
9.	Purchasing power parities and exchange rates between pairs of ESCAP countries and areas	21
10.	Per capita GDP of Japan according to Asian and OECD average price structure	23
11.	Relative price indices of the main expenditure categories	24
12.	Comparison of real per capita consumption for 11 ESCAP countries and areas, including Nepal	33
13.	Purchasing power parities and exchange rates of the Nepalese rupee in other ESCAP countries and areas	33
14.	Quantity structure similarity indices, gross domestic product	34
15.	Quantity structure similarity indices, household consumption	35
16.	Price structure similarity indices, gross domestic product	35
17.	Price structure similarity indices, household consumption	35
18.	Total and per capita real GDP in OECD and ESCAP member countries and areas in United States dollars, 1985	38
19.	Per capita GDP of Japan according to Asian and OECD average price structure	39
20.	Relative per capita GDP and growth rates in selected ESCAP countries and areas	41
21.	Growth of GDP, population and per capita real GDP between 1985 and 1990 in 10 ESCAP countries and areas	42
22.	Changes in exchange rates and consumer price indices in ESCAP countries and areas between 1985 and 1990	43

LIST OF ANNEX TABLES

		Page
A.1	Gross domestic product by expenditure categories in national currencies, 1985	44
A.2	Per capita gross domestic product by expenditure categories in national currencies, 1985	45
A.3	Percentage distribution of gross domestic product in national currencies, 1985	46
A.4	Per capita gross domestic product by expenditure categories in Asian dollars, 1985	47
A.5	Percentage distribution of gross domestic product in Asian dollars, 1985	48
A.6	Purchasing power parities in Asian dollars, 1985	49
A.7	Price indices, 1985	50
A.8i	Relative price indices, 1985	51
A.8ii	Relative price indices, 1985	52
A.9	Per capita quantity indices, 1985	53
A.10	Relative quantity indices, 1985	54
B.1	Total final consumption of Nepal at national and Asian average prices, 1985	55
B.2	Per capita total final consumption of Nepal, 1985	56
B.3	Per capita consumption of 11 ESCAP countries and areas at average prices of all countries areas in Asian dollars, 1985	57
C.1	Population, area, GDP and consumption of 11 ESCAP countries and areas	58
D.1	List of ESCAP basic headings (breakdown of GDP)	59

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The present publication describes the results and the methodology of the ESCAP regional comparison carried out within the framework of the International Comparison Programme (ICP) of the United Nations. The aim of this work was to compare real gross domestic product (GDP) and purchasing power parities (PPPs) among the countries/areas in the region. Eleven ESCAP members and associate members participated in this exercise: Bangladesh, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Hong Kong. Except for Nepal, which provided data only for the comparison on consumption, the other 10 participants provided data for GDP comparison. The ESCAP comparison has 1985 as the reference year and was organized in conjunction with the phase V world comparison of the ICP.

2. The activities organized for the ESCAP regional comparison received financial support from the Government of Japan, the Asian Development Bank and the United Nations Development Programme as well as the World Bank. The actual organizational activities in support of data collection at country level were undertaken jointly by the Statistical Office of the United Nations (UNSO) and the secretariat of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP). Data processing was undertaken by the Statistical Office. Experts of the World Bank, the Statistical Office of the European Communities (EUROSTAT), and the Statistics Bureau of Japan provided technical assistance to participating countries/ areas and assisted the secretariat in the project.

3. The preparatory work of the ESCAP comparison started with the seminar on methodology and practices of international comparisons, held at Sapporo, Japan, from 16 to 22 October 1984. Owing to some delays in obtaining the necessary funds, the actual comparison work could only start in September 1986, when the ESCAP/SIAP Workshop on the International Comparison Project Phase V Activities was convened by the ESCAP secretariat at Bangkok from 15 September to 3 October 1986 to finalize the regional specifications. Participants submitted their basic data to the Statistical Office during the first half of 1987. Subsequently the ESCAP/ADB/UNDP Workshop on the International Comparison Project was held at Bangkok from 5 to 9 October 1987 to review the preliminary results. In pursuance of the discussions at the Workshop and based on the supplementary information submitted by the countries after the Workshop, the Statistical Office revised the preliminary data and a second set of results was circulated to the participating countries/areas for comments and approval. The results presented in this document have incorporated some changes which the participants had proposed.

II. THE OBJECTIVES OF THE COMPARISON

4. ICP was established to provide a means, other than a direct conversion based on exchange rates, to real per capita GDP levels among the participating countries. GDP is the main synthetic accounting aggregate of the United Nations System of National Accounts (SNA), a system adopted by all participating countries/areas. The adjective "real" here denotes that price differences are eliminated, and the value data expressed for each country or area are based on a common set of international prices. These international prices are the weighted average prices for the ESCAP region (or, more precisely, for the countries/areas participating in the ESCAP regional comparison).

5. The conversion from national to international prices was carried out on the basis of PPPs. For this purpose the GDP of each country or area was broken down into a large number of categories (called basic headings) which are the smallest groups for which expenditure data can be estimated with reasonable reliability. The number of basic headings in the ESCAP comparison was 163. Within each basic heading,

there are numerous commodities which served as representative items for pricing. The PPP for the basic headings was determined on the basis of the prices of these commodities identified by detailed specifications.

6. The converted value data are expressed throughout the study in "Asian dollars". The Asian dollar is a nominal currency which plays the role of a numéraire only. Its purchasing power for the GDP total (taking all participating countries/areas together) equals the purchasing power of the United States dollar in 1985; thus, the total GDP of the whole region, whether expressed in Asian dollars or United States dollars, is the same. However, in each subdivision/group of the GDP, e.g., consumption, meat consumption, the purchasing power of the Asian dollar is determined on the basis of ESCAP average prices and has nothing to do with the United States price structure. The United States dollar was selected as numéraire since it was assumed that this is a currency the purchasing power of which is relatively well known throughout the entire region. A summary of the selection of the numéraire is given in chapter III.

7. The comparison basis in the case of the quantity indices presented in this report is the average ESCAP level, the weighted average value of all participating countries/areas. For instance, the quantity index of clothing for Japan at 407.8 per cent indicates that the per capita Japanese clothing consumption is 307.8 per cent higher than the average per capita consumption of all participating countries. The comparison basis in the case of PPPs and price indices is the Asian dollar (representing the average purchasing power in the region) as described in paragraph 6. The term price indices in this publication is used to express the ratio of the purchasing power and the exchange rate. Thus, the statement that the price level of the GDP is 83.4 per cent for Japan, 60.2 per cent for Hong Kong and 19.6 per cent for Bangladesh indicates that the PPPs of their currencies are 17.6, 39.8 and 81.4 per cent lower, respectively, than their official exchange rates to the United States dollar.

8. The per capita quantity indices such as those presented in table A.9, are good indicators of economic development. They cannot be considered, however, as expressions of welfare differences, since GDP, in general, is not supposed to express levels of welfare. Thus even differences in some economic factor, such as indebtedness and its consequences (interest payments), or pollution and other environmental degeneration are outside the scope of the real product comparison. Nevertheless, since there are no alternative national accounting aggregates considered more suitable, the ICP-type real GDPs provide the best comparisons of economic development levels in present conditions.

9. Real product comparisons based on PPPs provide a more stable basis for studying economic level differences than those based on exchange rates. The latter are negatively affected by large deviations of the exchange rates from the PPPs, and there is a general tendency that the more developed a country is, the higher is the exchange rate of its currency in comparison with its relative purchasing power. In addition, exchange rates fluctuate frequently and this may produce erratic changes in the results obtained by nominal product comparisons.

10. Percentage distributions of the elements of GDP, such as those presented in table A.3, enable a comparison of the expenditure structure of the participating countries/areas. Since the figures in table A.3 are based on data in national currencies, the distributions in this table are influenced both by quantity structure differences and by price structure differences. However, the figures in table A.5. are based on data in international prices and thus the distributions in this table reflect only quantity structure differences.

11. The results of the PPPs and price indices (tables A.6 and A.7), reflect the differences in the price structure between countries/areas and the deviations of the PPPs from the exchange rates. Table A.8 on relative price indices presents the comparison price level of the expenditure items in comparison with the general price level of their own GDP. The table is obtained by dividing the PPPs of GDP against those for the various expenditure items.

12. As Nepal's participation in the comparison was partial, covering consumption only, the data were not included in the overall comparison for the other 10 countries/areas, which covered also capital formation and net exports comparisons. In order to be able to present the results including Nepal, special tables on consumption comparison were compiled covering all the 11 countries/areas. It should be noted that the results in these tables differ to some extent from the results of the 10 country/area tables, since the average prices are based on 11 countries/areas.

III. THE METHODOLOGY IN DETAIL

A. Gross domestic product as used for the International Comparison Programme

13. GDP, as it is used for ICP purposes, is the same as defined in the SNA. ESCAP countries, in general, follow the recommendations of the SNA, however, as do other parts of the world, with some deviations. In order to ensure that these deviations did not cause considerable incomparabilities, participating countries were asked: (a) to report all significant deviations; and (b) if the deviations were considerable, to correct the GDP as calculated for national purposes in order to make it comparable for the ICP.

14. Countries which submitted information on deviations from the SNA indicated that the incomparabilities were relatively small, and that, in many cases, they did not have the necessary basic data to carry out the corrections. In fact, the organizers of the ICP are not aware of any correction made to the total of GDP by any participating country.

15. Nevertheless, the GDP data submitted for the comparison are not exactly the same as the data reported for the United Nations Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics. However, the differences are relatively small; in most cases they are within the $\pm$ 1.5 per cent limit, and most likely, such differences are normally due to the customary periodic revisions of the results already published. In a particular case, revision took place between the submissions of the two sets of data for ICP. Relatively larger differences can be observed only for Pakistan (8.6 per cent), and Thailand (5.3 per cent). Both confirmed the adjustments were justified.

B. The delineation of household consumption from government consumption

16. The ICP compares GDPs, showing the breakdown of expenditure categories into household consumption, government consumption, gross capital formation, and exports minus imports. In this respect there is one important difference in the classification of expenditure category between ICP and SNA. While the SNA allocates health and educational expenses incurred by the Government to government consumption expenditure (and not household consumption expenditure), the ICP, considering that both health and educational activities are primarily of benefit to households, allocates them to household consumption. This has been the ICP practice since its very beginning, and this principle was also adopted for the ESCAP comparison. The advantage of this approach is that total expenditures for health and educational consumption could be compared irrespective of how much was financed by the households themselves and how much by the Government.

17. Accordingly, for the purposes of the ESCAP regional comparison, all participating countries/areas transferred government expenditure on health and education from government consumption to household consumption. In principle, this transfer should have been done exclusive of expenditure incurred for the administration of health and education by the Government. However, since most of the countries found it difficult to separate administrative expenses from other expenses for health and education, the total expenses for health and education, inclusive of the administrative expenses, were transferred to household consumption. Similar adjustments were proposed in respect of government expenses for welfare purposes (e.g., old-age homes); however, since most of the countries/areas in the region were not able to separate

these data, no adjustments were made in this respect.

C. Breakdown of gross domestic product into analytical categories

18. Analytical categories, those expenditure categories for which the results are to be presented and analysed, are the same in each region of the world comparison. They have not changed since the very beginning of the ICP, and they differ only slightly from the expenditure classification proposed by the 1968 SNA. There are 42 smallest analytical categories (e.g. meat, clothing) and 15 aggregated analytical categories (e.g. food, clothing and footwear). Practically all the tables of this report present the results in the analytical category breakdown.

D. Breakdown of gross domestic product into "basic headings"

19. In order to improve the accuracy of the conversion of the expenditure data from the national currency to the international prices, GDP was broken down into technical categories, so-called basic headings. The basic headings play the role of strata in the conversion; it is assumed that the dispersion of price relatives within the basic headings is lower than the dispersion in the whole aggregate. As is known from the general theory of statistics, in stratified surveys the smaller the dispersion, the smaller the error stemming from the incompleteness of the observation is expected to be. The basic headings (groups such as bread and rice) have only a technical role; the results of basic heading breakdowns are not intended for publication or analysis. The reason for not presenting the basic heading results in this study is the assumption that at this degree of detail they are not sufficiently reliable.

20. Basic headings are the smallest categories for which expenditure data can be estimated reasonably well in all participating countries. In the ESCAP comparison 163 basic headings were distinguished and listed in annex table D. It was recognized that national statistical offices, in general, use only a less detailed breakdown of expenditures for their own purposes; however, countries/areas were encouraged to carry out these estimations since a more detailed breakdown will play a beneficial role in the reduction of the conversion error, even though estimations may be made on a relatively rough basis.

E. Selection of price representatives

21. PPPs were determined on the basis of the prices of selected specifications. Within each basic heading a number of specifications were selected. Countries were requested to submit national average prices for each specification that they were able to price. PPPs for each basic heading were obtained as unweighted geometric means of the individual price relatives. Weights in terms of quantity or value for individual specifications, in general, were not available; this is why unweighted averages of the price relatives were calculated (as in other regions of the ICP). Geometric averages were preferred since they satisfied the country reversal test.

22. The selection of the specifications was made in an attempt to satisfy three basic requirements: (a) that the specifications priced in the different countries should be identical, or almost identical (the quality differences among them should be relatively small); (b) that the specifications priced should be "characteristic" of the given country or area, that is, that the items priced are used in substantial quantities in the given country or area, since "uncharacteristic" products may have incidental prices, which are far from representing the general price level in the given category; and (c) that the number of specifications priced should be large enough to capture sufficiently the price structure of the basic heading.

23. Maximum similarity is obtained if specifications are defined very strictly, using a large number of characteristic features. This is possible in many instances, e.g., an oscillating table fan is described as being a three-speed, push-button type, 41 cm in diameter, with plastic blades and metal blade guard, without timer or light. However, to strive for maximum comparability in general is not always

advantageous in international comparisons since in this way the number of comparable specifications, and consequently, the representativity of the indices would be reduced substantially (because in a large number of cases the specifications in the different countries are not exactly the same). Therefore, some loosening of the definitions of the specifications (allowing for small quality differences) may have been more advantageous. In reality, in the ESCAP comparison even this optimally moderate comparability could not be attained in a number of cases. Partly because of time constraints and partly because of limitations in the knowledge of commodity characteristics by the experts present at the workshops, all relevant characteristics for all selected specifications could not be checked. It is assumed, therefore, that at the level of the basic headings in a number of cases the PPPs obtained may be distorted by some quality differences. It is hoped, however, that at a higher level of aggregation these undesirable effects cancel out to a considerable extent and the distortion caused by quality differences for the aggregated results is only relatively small.

24. In the ESCAP comparison, emphasis was given to the characteristicity requirement. Countries were requested to indicate in all cases the degree of characteristicity of the priced items, distinguishing items used in large quantities (very characteristic items, denoted by 3), those used in medium quantities (moderately characteristic items, denoted by 2) and those used in small or minuscule quantities (uncharacteristic items, denoted by 1). In the PPP computation, in general, only items with signs 3 and 2 were taken into account. The prices of uncharacteristic items, i.e. those with sign 1, were used only in a few exceptional cases, when for some countries comparable items with signs 3 and 2 were missing entirely.

25. For the preparation of an ESCAP regional list of specifications, a tentative list was prepared by the secretariat and a consultant. The specifications were discussed at the first workshop, and the list was finalized by the experts present. Altogether for household consumption 1,533 specifications were priced, most of them by the Philippines (1127), Sri Lanka (878) and Thailand (736), the fewest by the Islamic Republic of Iran (333), the Republic of Korea (350) and Nepal (390).

26. For a large majority of the basic headings it was possible to meet, at least to a reasonable extent, all the three above-mentioned requirements. For a number of basic headings, however, special difficulties were encountered, and at least one of the above requirements could not be satisfied, even to the minimally required extent. In such cases special solutions had to be applied; they are described below.

27. In a number of basic headings, quality differences among the specifications priced by the various countries were so large that ignoring them, and calculating the basic parities from the prices submitted by the countries, would cause substantial distortion. This situation was typical in many producer durable categories. It was not possible to delete these items, because this would harm significantly the representativity of the indices (in some basic headings there were no comparable products at all, owing to the large quality differences). In a number of these situations, adjustments according to the quality differences seemed to be the relatively best solution.

28. For a number of producer durables, each country or area received a detailed description of the quality characteristics (such as size, capacity, speed and weight) of the specifications priced in the partner countries or areas and was requested to estimate the value (price) differences caused by the quality differences between its own product and the products priced in the partner countries or areas. If those estimations were concordant, an adjustment of the crude price relatives was made accordingly. For instance the quality of the centrifugal washing machine in Japan was considered about 45 per cent superior in quality to the washing machines priced both in Hong Kong and in the Republic of Korea. Accepting these expert estimations, the prices of the Hong Kong and Republic of Korea washing machines were augmented by 45 per cent (adjusted to the quality of the Japanese machines). If the estimations made by Hong Kong and Republic of Korea differed substantially, the specification in question, in general, was not included in the PPP calculations. In a few cases the Statistical Office made its own estimations of the percentages of the quality differences.

29. It should be emphasized that these quality difference estimations, even if carried out with great care are far from perfect. Differences may be encountered in respect of a number of quality characteristics; some of them are difficult to express in quantitative terms and in many cases it is not easy to determine how a given quality characteristic affects the market price and what weights should be allocated to the different quality characteristics. Nevertheless, it was assumed that when such corrections were made, the results obtained in that way were better than if the PPP calculations had been made without adjustment, or if the item in question had been omitted from the calculation.

30. In about 10 basic headings even quality adjustments could not provide acceptably reliable PPPs. It was decided that the expenditure of these categories will be converted not by their own PPPs but by the PPPs of other basic headings. From which basic heading(s) should the PPP be borrowed was determined by seeking the strongest possible correlation in price differences. For instance, basic heading 163024, "other long distance transport", was converted by the average PPP of six other transport services categories (163011 through 163023). Similar imputations were applied to a somewhat larger extent in some countries/areas, where basic data were missing or non-comparable. For example, Pakistan's results used "borrowed purchasing power parities" for 15 basic headings, and Bangladesh used it for 13 basic headings.

31. For some basic headings, it was considered necessary to use other methods to estimate the PPPs. These methods are described in section F below.

F. Special cases of the purchasing power comparison

1. Objects of construction

32. Capital formation consists to a large extent of objects of construction, such as residential buildings, office buildings, roads and bridges. As in any national or inter-temporal quantity or price index computation, including the ICP, construction presents the most difficulties, since an overwhelming majority of the construction objects consist of "unique goods", products that are in one of the countries/ areas and periods compared but not in the other. Traditional methods of index calculations do not promise satisfactory results.

33. In the ESCAP comparison, as in other regions of ICP work, the so-called "bill of quantities" method was used. The basic consideration in using this method is that the objects of construction as such are not comparable among countries/areas, and it was therefore difficult to estimate quality corrections to make them comparable. However, the components of the objects, such as quantities of walls in terms of cubic metres, are comparable among countries/areas. Thus, instead of comparing the objects as such, PPPs are determined on the basis of the comparison of costs of the various components. Various packages of components, a so-called "bill of quantities", are selected for this purpose: for example, all components of a standard primary school are identified. Countries were asked to price all components of these standard objects and this pricing served as a basis for determining the PPPs in the construction object basic headings.

34. Ideally, a bill of quantities specific to the ESCAP region should have been applied. However, owing to time constraints and limitations in resources, it was not possible to work out a specific Asian bill of quantities, and those prepared for the European and African comparisons were used. Eight specifications were selected for the ESCAP comparison: five from the European list and three from the African list, those which were considered closest to the typical Asian objects.

2. Dwelling consumption

35. The unique product character of buildings presents comparability problems not only in respect of capital formation but also when a part of this capital stock is consumed, i.e., in terms of rent consumption on a dwelling. Like buildings in general, apartments are also very different from country to country; for the rental, however, the conventional methods could be used for the PPP calculations. Since the functions of the dwellings are practically the same in all countries, using a very detailed breakdown in designing price representatives, quality differences of apartments are thus taken into consideration. Other factors related to housing, for example, location, convenience and security, are thus not included.

36. The ESCAP specification list included more than 50 dwelling rent representative items. The following classifications were used for the various specifications:

(a) Modern dwellings, traditional dwellings and semi-traditional dwellings;

(b) Apartments, detached houses, semi detached houses and terrace or row houses;

(c) Availability of electricity, water, and bath;

(d) Availability of central heating/air conditioning;

(e) Size of the dwelling in square metres;

Of course, the criteria listed above do not cover all quality characteristics of the dwellings, such as the age of the building, where the dwelling is located, environmental factors and transport facilities. Nevertheless, it was felt that, with the criteria distinguished by the specifications, major quality differences in terms of the utility of dwellings were appropriately caught by the representative items and in that way an acceptable degree of accuracy was obtained.

3. Health services

37. The method applied for the PPP and quantity index computation for the health comparison, requires special explanation, owing to its complex character. The problems stem from following:

(a) A part of the health services is provided by private units (private hospitals, practitioners), a part by government units;

(b) Government health services may be of a market character (the households pay for them), or of a non-market character (they are provided free of charge or for a nominal fee only);

(c) Market-type government services are generally less expensive than private health services; at the same time, however, they are also inferior in quality compared with the private services;

(d) In general, there are no direct measures for expressing the differences in the quality of services.

It should also be noted that the proportions among private, market-type government, and non-market type government services differ from country to country or area in the ESCAP region and that the basic data available on health consumption in many countries were very limited.

38. In view of the above, only a relatively rough method could be applied for comparing consumption of health services. According to this method, for the comparison three groups of health services were distinguished from each other:

(a) Private services, for which price representative items were selected and the PPPs were determined accordingly;

(b) Government market-type services, for which price representative items were also selected; however, these services were separated from the private services and included in separate basic headings, and the representative items selected were also different;

(c) Government non-market type services, for which the consumption was expressed by cost (and not by market values., and for which the implicit PPPs of general government consumption were used for the conversion.

This three-way breakdown does not mean that all countries/areas should have expenditure data for all three categories. For instance, some countries or areas may not have non-market type health services at all.

39. The implicit assumption behind the treatment described is that services provided within the three groups (e.g., an appendectomy carried out in a private hospital, in a government market-type hospital and in a government non-market type hospital) are three different products and represent three different qualities, and consequently quantities. Whether or not the price/cost differences among these products (market value of the private service versus different market value of the government market-type service, versus cost of the government non-market type service) reflect well the quality differences among these services is somewhat questionable; however, in the absence of any other measure of the quality differences, it seemed that there was no better solution than to accept this assumption.

4. Educational services

40. The problems of the educational services are very similar to those of the health services, with the only difference that in the former case instead of a three-way breakdown a two-way breakdown seemed to be satisfactory. In addition to privately financed education, only non-market type government-financed education was distinguished. All primary education was allocated to the non-market type government-financed education, while secondary and higher level education were split according to the actual sources of financing.

41. For privately financed education, specifications were selected and the purchasing power comparison was made in the usual way. As for government-financed education, no specifications were selected and the implicit PPP of the general government consumption was applied for the conversion.

5. Consumption of general government

42. Consumption of general Government is valued at cost level (and not at market price level) both in the national accounts and in the ICP. Therefore, the conversion is to be made on the basis of "cost representatives" instead of price representatives. For this purpose the cost of the general government consumption was split into two parts:

(a) Compensation of employees (wages and salaries plus contributions to social security and pension funds) was converted on the basis of a PPP obtained from selected job average earning "specifications", such as the average earnings of a policeman with a 10-year service career. With this method, again a questionable assumption is implied, in particular, that the same type of job (e.g., that of a police officer) provides the same quantity of services in all countries/areas (without differences in the levels of productivity). In the absence of any reliable information on the levels of productivity, however, it was not possible to use a better method.

(b) Intermediate consumption and consumption of fixed capital by the general Government was converted by an average PPP calculated on the basis of the PPPs of total household consumption and total capital formation. Specific PPPs calculated on the basis of the actual consumption structure of the general Government would do better; however, as in other

regions of the world comparison, no sufficient basic information was available in the participating countries/areas to use this more accurate method.

G. The method applied for the aggregation of the basic heading results

43. On the basis of the PPPs obtained for each basic heading, quantity indices and PPPs are calculated for aggregated categories, (such as those which were referred to as analytical categories), and for the GDP as a total. In the ESCAP comparison the same aggregation formula was applied which had been used in the ICP work from its very beginning: the so called Geary-Khamis formula.

44. The Geary-Khamis formula is a multilateral method of international comparisons, the most characteristic feature of which is that (weighted) average regional prices are used as weights for the quantity indices. Details of this formula, as well as its properties, are extensively described in many earlier publications of the ICP; in this study only the most important features will be repeated.

45. The Geary-Khamis method is based on the notion that there are two sets of unknowns: (a) overall parities of currencies; and (b) international prices of basic headings. The international price for a given category is the quantity-weighted average of the prices observed in each country for that category after they have been made commensurate by being divided by their respective country PPPs. The international price could be easily computed if the global PPPs were known, and the global PPPs if the international prices were known. With the Geary-Khamis formula, both the global PPPs and the international prices can be found at once by establishing and solving a set of simultaneous equations, their number being equal to the number of countries minus one plus the number of basic headings. This set of equations is solved by iteration. The method provides simultaneously all international prices and all PPPs. For applying the Geary-Khamis method to ICP, it was necessary to move from the concrete definition of price in observable physical units as used in the original Geary-Khamis method to the abstract concept of PPPs for basic headings. Thus, instead of actual prices, a set of international price *relatives* is used for comparing the national quantities derived from expenditures. Therefore, the inputs for the equation are the PPPs of the various countries for each basic heading and the real values obtained as the ratio of the expenditure for each basic heading to the corresponding PPP.

H. The selection of the numéraire

46. Since the quantity comparison of the GDP components is carried out by a set of international price *relatives* derived from the average prices of the 10 ESCAP countries/areas, the overall results are not dependent on the existence of a numéraire country/area or which country's or area's currency is selected as a numéraire. Nevertheless, for many purposes it is very convenient to express the level of GDP or per capita level of GDP of the individual countries/areas in absolute terms using the currency unit of a selected country/area. In the earlier phases of the ICP, the United States dollar was the numéraire applied for worldwide comparisons. In the European Economic Community, the ECU (European currency unit) is adopted for inter-community comparisons. For the European Comparison Programme, covering 20 countries in 1985, the Austrian schilling was used as the numéraire. Thus, it is a rather arbitrary decision and a question of consensus which country and which currency are selected as numéraires since the numéraire does not influence the relative size and structure of countries' GDP. The agreement on the selection of a numéraire currency has basically the same function in economic comparison as the agreement in the use of the Celsius or Fahrenheit scale for measuring the degree of temperature in physics: both show the same relatives but use different grades; therefore the user should know what is the unit used for measurement. It should also be noted that not only the level of GDP but the interpretation and understanding of PPPs and their relation to the exchange rates also depend on the selected numéraire because these indicators are also specified in the context of a given currency.

47. There are basically three possibilities for selecting a numéraire for the ESCAP comparison:

(a) The first version is to select the currency unit of one country/area participating in the ESCAP comparison, for example, the Japanese yen, the Hong Kong dollar or any other currency.

(b) The second and third versions are common in that, in both cases the United States dollar is selected as the numéraire since this currency is generally accepted for international comparison and its purchasing power is well known all over the world and also in the ESCAP region. There are two ways to define the United States dollar as a numéraire. In the second version, the United States dollar value for the total of the participating countries is achieved by converting the national values of GDP by the official exchange rates into United States dollars country by country/area. This version is simple and can easily be applied; however, it has an important disadvantage: in most countries, the official exchange rates deviate to a great extent (in some cases 4-5 times) from the actual PPPs. Therefore, the numéraire calculated in this way is not the same.[1]

(c) The third possibility is to select again the United States dollar as the numéraire for the ESCAP comparison, however that currency which has the same purchasing power as the United States dollar in the United States over the GDP. This kind of numéraire can be selected only if at the time of finalizing the ESCAP comparison the results of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) comparisons were already available, providing information on the PPPs of Japan and the United States. Through Japan the PPPs for any ESCAP country/area can be defined in relation to the United States dollar. The use of this numéraire has the advantage that the absolute levels of GDP (but only of global GDP) can be directly compared with the GDP level of any OECD or, other country for which the United States dollar was selected as a numeraire. For indicating the specific content and nature of the third variant of numeraire (it is referred to in this report as the "Asian dollar") which has at the global level of GDP the same purchasing power as the United States dollar, all components of GDP are however, measured with the average prices of the 10 ESCAP countries/areas. Therefore, the components of GDP, although expressed in United States dollars, are not directly comparable with similar components expressed in OECD average prices.

48. Since the selection of the numéraire is of great importance in presenting and understanding the results of the comparison, e.g., the magnitude of the per capita GDP levels and PPPs, table 1 below shows the procedure used in determining the numéraire in three different versions. In all cases the "Asian dollar" is defined as the numéraire; however, its meaning and absolute levels are different.

The first column in the table shows the values derived from nominal national GDP values by conversion with exchange rates of the individual countries/areas. The total of the 10 countries/areas is considered as the numeraire (1963 billion United States dollars). This amount is then distributed between countries/areas according to the volume indices calculated for each country/area with average Asian prices. It is why this numeraire is called the "Asian dollar". The third column is derived from the GDP of Japan expressed in United States dollars through the actual purchasing power of the yen over the United States dollar as calculated in the OECD comparison. It means that the Japan GDP (1,425.3 billions) is expressed at the level of the United States dollar. The GDP values for the other countries/areas are derived from this value by the volume indices calculated with average Asian prices. In other words, Asian dollar values are increased for all countries/areas by 48 per cent in order to bring the numeraire upto the same purchasing power level as the United States dollar. Since this numéraire reflects the volume ratios obtained with Asian average prices, this numéraire can also be called the "Asian dollar". In the last column of table 1, the starting point of the calculation is the value of GDP of Hong Kong converted by official exchange rate

[1] This type of numéraire was first applied in phase IV of ICP for the comparison of 15 African countries, and it was called the "African dollar". It should be mentioned that at the time of presenting the results of the African comparison, no results were available for actual PPPs between any country of Africa and the United States.

Table 1. Three versions of determining the numeraire for the ESCAP comparison

	Global value of GDP in 10 ESCAP countries/areas in billions of Asian dollars			
	Derived by exchange rates		*Derived by PPPs via Japan*	*Derived by changes via Hong Kong*
	Originally converted dollar values (1)	*Total numéraire distributed according to volume indices* (2)	(3)	(4)
Japan	1 329.7	963.1	1 425.3	857.4
Hong Kong	33.5	37.5	55.6	33.5
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	173.6	149.0	220.5	132.7
Republic of Korea	86.6	110.7	163.7	98.5
Thailand	40.4	91.3	135.2	81.4
Sri Lanka	5.7	19.8	29.3	17.6
Philippines	32.9	66.1	97.8	58.8
Pakistan	31.0	88.4	130.8	78.7
Bangladesh	16.1	55.3	81.8	49.2
India	213.5	381.8	564.9	339.7
Total	1 963.0	1 963.0	2 904.9	1 747.5

to United States dollars (33.5, which is the same as in column one), and then, average Asian prices; the dollar values are derived from this numéraire. The ratios of volumes between the countries/areas are the same as in the two previous cases; however, the level of the Asian dollar is 40 per cent below that, reflecting the "true" purchasing power of the United States dollar.

49. While the volume indices of global and per capita real GDP between countries/areas are the same in all versions of the numeraire, the levels of GDP and PPP are different. For example, per capita GDP of Japan in Asian dollars is 7,976, 11,804 and 7,100 in the order of the above-mentioned three versions. At the same time the PPP of the yen over the Asian dollar is 328.65, 222.066 and 369.17. Accordingly, the price levels of the individual countries/areas are also different if the above-mentioned PPPs are related to the 1985 average exchange rate; the price index (PPP per exchange rate) in Japan is 138.1, 93.3 and 155.1 per cent, depending on the numeraire selected. The same figures for India are the following.

Table 2. Effect of the different numéraires on the main results of India

	If the numéraire is		
	exchange rate converted	*PPP converted via Japan Japan*	*exchange rate converted via Hong Kong*
Per capita GDP, dollar	506	748	450
Purchasing power parity, Indian Rupee	6.917	4.675	7.775
Price index, percentage	55.9	37.8	62.9

Considering the advantages and disadvantages of the above-mentioned and other possible versions of selecting a numéraire, the PPP converted dollar value was adopted for the ESCAP comparison, which is shown in column three of table 1. and mentioned as the third version in paragraph 47.

I. Linking the results of the ESCAP comparison to the results of other countries participating in phase V in other regions

50. The ESCAP comparison is part of a world level comparison covering 64 countries in phase V of the ICP. A global report including the data for the ESCAP countries, will be issued jointly by the United Nations Statistical Office and EUROSTAT. Here only a few comments are made on the results shown in the present report in respect of comparison between ESCAP and OECD member countries/areas.

51. There is only one bridge linking the countries/areas in the ESCAP region to the rest of the ICP world: Japan's double participation both in ESCAP and OECD comparisons. Since OECD comparisons cover 22 of its members, including all countries of the European Economic Community (EEC), it is easy to link the results between any pair of these 32 countries/areas. Any data on an ESCAP country or area can be connected with any OECD country via Japan by chaining the corresponding price or volume indices. For instance, the Philippines-New Zealand volume index of per capita household consumption can be determined as the product of the corresponding volume index for Philippines-Japan and Japan-New Zealand. Since per capita consumption of the Philippines is 19.66 per cent of Japan's level, and the latter is 108.11 per cent of the New Zealand level, the volume index of per capita household consumption for the Philippines in relation to New Zealand is 21.9 per cent.

$$\left(\frac{Ph}{J} \cdot \frac{J}{NZ} - \frac{Ph}{NZ}\right) ; \quad 0.1966 \times 1.0811 = 0.213).$$

52. Two linkages are necessary for the comparisons between an ESCAP country/area and an EEC country since the 12 member countries of the EEC are compared with the help of average EEC prices. The results of the EEC comparison, which are used for a number of Community policy decisions, are preserved in the OECD comparison. In this wider frame of comparison the EEC is treated as a single entity. For this entity the results are available both at average EEC and average OECD prices. The ratios between these two sets of volumes represent the correction factors for comparing a component of GDP between Japan and any EEC member country.

53. As regards the comparison of ESCAP countries/areas with countries of other regions, the situation varies from region to region. With countries of Europe Group II (Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia) the comparison can be carried out through two bridges: first the results should be linked via Japan with Austria, then via Austria with the corresponding country. (Austria served as a base and bridge country between Europe Group I and Group II). In any case it is quite evident that the intraregional results are much more meaningful and reliable than the interregional comparisons; therefore the latter should be handled with greater caution.

54. In the linking of the ESCAP and OECD results of the ICP comparison for 1985, a specific problem should be mentioned which originates from the considerable delay of the ESCAP comparison in relation to the OECD comparison. Japan presented for the OECD work preliminary data on global GDP and its breakdown in 1986, while for the ESCAP comparison a revised set of data was forwarded to the United Nations Statistical Office in 1987. The difference between the two aggregates (316,114 and 316,864 billion yen) is only 0.2 per cent, much below the limits of error permissible in such kind of comparison. Nevertheless, it causes a dilemma both in the present publication and in the world level report on ICP: which of the two sets of data should be included for Japan.[1] The decision is not easy since these two different set of data were used for calculating all results separately in the two groups. Therefore, any change in nominal national expenditures modifies either the real value of GDP or the PPP. For the present report, the following "solution" was adopted. First, the ESCAP report preserves the nominal national values of expenditures as reported by Japan for the ESCAP comparison. Second, in order to bring the

[1] It should be noted that, owing to the revisions of the 1985 basic data on GDP, the per capita GDP dollar values for 1985 are revised for almost all OECD member countries published in later years.

numeraire of the ESCAP comparison to the purchasing power level of the United States dollar, the original PPP between the Japanese Yen and United States dollar (222) is taken over from the OECD comparison.[2] Consequently, the real per capita GDP level of Japan calculated in the OECD comparison (11,795) is increased to 11,804 dollars. (In recent OECD publications the revised figure of Japan's per capita GDP in PPP converted United States dollar is 11,805 for 1985.)

IV. RESULTS OF THE COMPARISON

A. Level of global and per capita real GDP

55. The global amount of GDP expressed in comparable prices is generally considered a good approximation of the relative size of a country's economy and per capita real GDP is generally accepted as a good approximation of relative economic development. As noted in the above chapter on methodology, in the ESCAP comparison the total and per capita GDP is expressed in terms of the "Asian dollar", which has the same purchasing power over GDP as the United States dollar in the United States.

56. The total GDP for the 10 countries/areas participating in the ESCAP region in phase V amounted to 2,905 billion "Asian dollars" in 1985. About half of this amount was produced in Japan, one fifth in India, less than 8 per cent in Iran, 6 per cent in the Republic of Korea. The share of the other countries individually was less than 5 per cent. It is worth mentioning that in the same year the GDP of the United States alone was nearly 4,000 billion United States dollars and that of the 12 member countries of the European Economic Community was near to 3,500 billion "EC dollars" (this numéraire also has the same purchasing power over GDP as the "Asian dollar" and the United States dollar). The average per capita GDP level for the 10 ESCAP countries/areas covering a relatively very large population is rather low at 2,255 dollars. As shown in table 3.1 below there are great differences in per capita real GDP among the ESCAP countries/areas; in the most developed, Japan, it is 16 times higher than in the less developed, India.

Table 3. Total and per capita gross domestic product in 10 ESCAP countries/areas

	Total GDP in billions of national currency	*PP per Asian dollar*	*Total GDP (Billions of Asian dollars)*	*Mid-year population (millions)*	*Per capita GDP as percentage of*		
					In Asian dollars	*average ESCAP level*	*United States level*
Japan	316 864	222.3088	1425.3	120.75	11 804	523.5	71.6
Hong Kong	261	4.6879	55.6	5.45	10 194	452.1	61.8
Iran, (Islamic Rep. of)	15 276	69.2775	220.5	47.82	4 611	204.5	28.0
Korea, Rep. of	75 349	460.3033	163.7	41.21	3 972	176.2	24.1
Thailand	1 097	8.1077	135.2	51.30	2 636	116.9	16.0
Sri Lanka	155	5.2968	29.3	15.84	1 849	82.0	11.2
Philippines	617	6.3071	97.8	54.67	1 788	79.3	10.8
Pakistan	493	3.7672	130.8	97.67	1 340	59.4	8.1
Bangladesh	498	6.0849	81.8	98.66	829	36.8	5.0
India	2 641	4.6752	564.9	755.00	748	33.2	4.5
Total or average of 10 ESCAP countries/ areas	-	-	2 904.9	1 288.37	2 255	100.0	13.7
Memorandum items:							
United States		1.0000	3 946 615	239.30	16 494	731.8	100.0
European Economic Communities (12 countries)			3377146	321.60	10 502	465.9	63.7

[2] For roundings and some minor technical reasons the PPP of the yen to the United States dollar in the ESCAP comparison deviates in the decimals from the originally calculated PPP.

57. The 10 ESCAP countries/areas may be categorized into four groups according to real GDP level. They are

(a) The most developed countries/areas in the region: Japan and Hong Kong, with a per capita level 4 to 5 times higher than the ESCAP average.

(b) The above average countries in the region: the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of Korea and Thailand belong to this group;

(c) The below average countries in the region, with a level between 50 and 100 per cent of the average: Pakistan, the Philippines and Sri Lanka belong to this group.

(d) The least developed countries in the region: Bangladesh and India, with a level of around one third of the ESCAP average.

58. Since the main purpose of the ESCAP comparison was the measurement of real economic development levels between the countries/areas of the region, it is worthwhile to compare the per capita GDP not only with the United States level or the average of the region but also to show its relative level for each pair of countries.

Table 4. Relative levels of per capita real GDP, all pairs of ESCAP countries and areas (in percentage)

	Per capita GDP of countries/areas in the heading = 100									
	Japan	*Hong Kong*	*Iran (Islamic Rep. of)*	*Rep. of Korea*	*Thailand*	*Sri Lanka*	*Philip-pines*	*Pakistan*	*Bangla-desh*	*India*
Japan	100.0									
Hong Kong	86.4	100.0								
Iran, (Islamic Rep. of)	39.1	45.2	100.0							
Republic of Korea	33.6	39.0	86.1	100.0						
Thailand	22.3	25.9	57.2	66.4	100.0					
Sri Lanka	15.7	18.1	40.1	46.6	70.1	100.0				
Philippines	15.1	17.5	38.8	45.0	67.8	96.7	100.0			
Pakistan	11.4	13.1	29.1	33.7	50.8	72.5	74.9	100.0		
Bangladesh	7.0	8.1	18.0	20.9	31.4	44.8	46.4	61.9	100.0	
India	6.3	7.3	16.2	18.8	28.4	40.5	41.8	55.8	90.2	100.0

B. Differences in per capita real GDP according to its main components

59. It is obvious that the great differences in per capita GDP are manifested practically in almost all components of the GDP, although not in the same proportion. Already, at the aggregate level of the 4-5 main components of GDP, considerable deviations of their volume indices from the overall volume index of GDP can be observed; however, at the level of analytical categories it is not exceptional but for some specific items it is the rule that at a higher level of GDP their consumption is connected with a lower level in absolute terms. Table 5. shows the differences of four main components within GDP.

60. Household consumption differences are somewhat smaller than GDP differences. While in the case of the per capita GDP, the most developed country or area is almost 16 times as high as the least developed country or area, in respect of per capita consumption differences this ratio is only around 13. The most interesting features in respect of the consumption differences are the following:

(a) Hong Kong's household consumption level is practically as high as the Japanese level;

(b) The household consumption level is relatively high in the Philippines and relatively low in Sri Lanka. While for GDP the level of Sri Lanka was a few percentage points higher than that of

the Philippines, in household consumption the Philippines level is higher by about 25 per cent.

(c) India's last position in the consumption comparison is more striking than in the GDP comparison. While in the case of the latter the Bangladesh level was only 10 per cent higher than the Indian one, in the case of the household consumption this difference attains almost 20 per cent (taking household consumption and government consumption together, the Bangladesh level is almost 28 per cent higher than the Indian level).

Table 5. Differences in per capita GDP according to the main components

Average ESCAP level = 100

Country/area	*GDP*	*Consumption of household*	*Government consumption*	*Capital formation*	
				including net export	*excluding net export*
Japan	523.5	483.8	218.4	698.7	652.7
Hong Kong	452.1	480.3	202.1	451.5	392.6
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	204.5	214.1	212.9	179.5	183.4
Rep. of Korea	176.2	163.3	153.3	212.8	229.0
Thailand	116.9	119.8	272.9	68.8	76.4
Sri Lanka	82.0	75.7	158.3	76.9	97.1
Philippines	79.3	95.1	139.4	25.9	23.0
Pakistan	59.4	64.4	185.5	14.5	23.4
Bangladesh	36.8	44.0	82.4	7.3	12.2
India	33.2	36.6	45.7	21.7	25.8

61. There were significant differences between the pattern of the government consumption and of the GDP. The ratio of the highest to the lowest per capita value of government consumption was only 6 as against 16 on the GDP. In addition, the rank among the countries/areas is different. Thailand's per capita value was the highest, about 25 per cent higher than the next highest, Japan's. Iran's per capita value was almost as high as Japan and Pakistan's level was nearly twice as high as the ESCAP average level.

62. Capital formation (inclusive of net exports) showed much larger differences among countries/areas than other aggregates. The Japanese per capita level was almost 100 times higher than that of Bangladesh. Other interesting features are:

(a) The extremely low level of Bangladesh's per capita capital formation, amounting to one third of the Indian level and only 7 per cent of the average ESCAP level;

(b) The very low level of Pakistan's and the Philippines' per capita capital formation, amounting to one seventh and one fourth respectively of the ESCAP average level;

(c) The relatively high level of the Republic of Korea's capital formation, more than double that of the ESCAP average level.

63. The value of capital formation exclusive of net exports did not differ much from the preceding one. The differences between the highest and lowest are somewhat smaller, but the Japanese level is still more than 50 times higher than the Bangladesh per capita level. The very low levels of Bangladesh and Pakistan were somewhat less accentuated and the relatively high level of the Republic of Korea exceeded a little its capital formation inclusive of net exports comparison.

C. Differences in per capita GDP according to analytical categories

64. Table 6 presents per capita quantity indices for the main components and the analytical categories of GDP of the 10 ESCAP countries/areas based on the average value among them. Table 6 highlights the data for eight groups of household consumption.

65. In analysing the figures in table 6 above and the differences in consumption of a more detailed breakdown of goods and services, the following specific features should be pointed out.

Table 6. Differences in household consumption according to the main groups of goods and services (average ESCAP level = 100)

	Japan	*Hong Kong*	*Iran (Islamic Rep. of)*	*Rep. of Korea*	*Thailand*	*Sri Lanka*	*Philip-pines*	*Pakistan*	*Bangla-desh*	*India*
Food, beverages and tobacco	282.1	243.8	228.4	185.7	138.5	100.7	159.2	79.8	72.8	56.3
Clothing, footwear	407.3	647.9	257.4	157.7	166.3	88.0	52.7	73.8	43.8	43.7
Gross rents, fuel, power	573.4	228.0	296.8	88.5	53.8	20.1	69.6	49.0	48.0	31.9
House fur-nishings	577.8	714.8	217.3	203.8	144.9	81.7	83.5	46.3	26.4	21.1
Medical care	742.2	336.4	188.8	95.1	102.7	44.2	24.9	25.4	9.9	18.1
Transport, communications	506.0	491.4	227.4	176.9	179.1	129.7	19.8	90.8	31.4	29.9
Recreation, education	641.0	793.4	84.5	187.3	115.4	78.8	72.1	44.6	17.1	24.1
Miscellaneous goods, services	653.7	1227.7	156.7	197.3	122.0	27.1	81.1	59.7	12.1	12.5

1. Food, beverage, and tobacco

66. The differences in per capita food consumption among countries/areas as in other regions of the world, are substantially smaller than that at total consumption or GDP level. The highest level (that of the Islamic Republic of Iran) is only four times as high as the lowest level (that of India). Apart from the Islamic Republic of Iran's surprising lead in per capita food consumption, the Philippines showed, in comparison to its GDP level, a relatively high level, 66 per cent higher than the average ESCAP level, of food consumption. The Philippines per capita food consumption is around the same level as that of the Republic of Korea, and more than twice as high as the Pakistani food consumption level, though its per capita GDP was only 33 per cent higher than that of Pakistan.

67. As to the internal structure of the food consumption, the following features seem to be the most characteristic: in bread and cereals consumption, the Philippines and the Republic of Korea led the others with 231 to 232 per cent of the average ESCAP level; Bangladesh showed a relatively high level, almost 50 per cent higher than the average ESCAP level. This was the only analytical category where the per capita level of Bangladesh was higher than the average ESCAP level. Sri Lanka followed with 34 per cent higher than the average ESCAP level. Meat consumption is highest in Hong Kong (687 per cent of the average level), followed by the Islamic Republic of Iran (587 per cent), Japan (265 per cent), the Philippines (203 per cent), and Thailand (179 per cent). Relatively low in meat consumption were Bangladesh (69 per cent), Sri Lanka (33 per cent), and India 25 per cent). Fish consumption is relatively high in the Philippines (354 per cent), in Thailand (294 per cent) and in Sri Lanka (145 per cent) and relatively low in India (22 per cent) and the Islamic Republic of Iran (21 per cent). However, milk, cheese and eggs consumption is by far the highest in the Islamic Republic of Iran (280 per cent), relatively high in India (93 per cent) and Pakistan (95

per cent) and relatively low in Japan (177 per cent), Hong Kong (121 per cent), Thailand (52 per cent) and Bangladesh (26 per cent). Oils and fats consumption is relatively high in the Islamic Republic of Iran (209 per cent), Pakistan (143 per cent) and India (106 per cent) and relatively low in Japan (97 per cent), the Philippines (53 per cent) and especially the Republic of Korea (44 per cent) and Sri Lanka (21 per cent). Fruits and vegetables consumption is by far the highest in the Islamic Republic of Iran (340 per cent) and relatively high in Sri Lanka (137 per cent) and India (72 per cent).

68. The differences in per capita beverage consumption are very large. The Japanese level is about 500 times as high as that of Bangladesh and almost 40 times as high as that of the Islamic Republic of Iran and India. Alcoholic beverage differences are even higher, since in the Islamic Republic of Iran and Pakistan (for religious reasons) the consumption is nil. Relatively high is the alcoholic beverage consumption in the Republic of Korea (337 per cent of the ESCAP average level), Thailand (171 per cent) and Sri Lanka (90 per cent). Tobacco consumption is relatively high in the Republic of Korea (282 per cent) and Sri Lanka (110 per cent), the Philippines (120 per cent), Pakistan (105 per cent) and Bangladesh (78 per cent) and relatively low in the Islamic Republic of Iran (96 per cent) and Thailand (83 per cent).

2. Clothing and footwear

69. In the category total of clothing and footwear consumption, the differences among countries/areas are approximately of the same magnitude as the differences in the per capita GDP. The highest per capita level is about 15 times as high as the lowest. In footwear consumption alone the differences are larger, the highest per capita exceeds the lowest one by almost 30 times. The highest clothing and footwear consumption can be observed in Hong Kong (648 per cent). Relatively high consumption levels were also observed in the Islamic Republic of Iran (258 per cent) and Thailand (166 per cent). Relatively low is the clothing and footwear consumption in Japan (only four times as high as the average ESCAP level, while the per capita GDP is more than five times higher) and in the Philippines (53 per cent). Footwear consumption is especially high in Hong Kong (819 per cent), more than double the Japanese per capita level; and in the Islamic Republic of Iran (464 per cent) and relatively low in Thailand (48 per cent), in Bangladesh (34 per cent) and especially in India (29 per cent).

3. Gross rents, fuel and power

70. For this group as a whole only Japan (574 per cent) and Hong Kong (228 per cent) are above the ESCAP average level, the lowest level can be observed for Sri Lanka (20 per cent), India (32 per cent), Bangladesh (48 per cent), Pakistan (49 per cent) and Thailand (54 per cent). The figure on gross rents alone presents a similar picture, but with larger differences. Especially low is the gross rents consumption in Sri Lanka, only 9 per cent of the average ESCAP level, and 1.4 per cent of the Japanese level. In fuel and power consumption the Islamic Republic of Iran's consumption is the highest (392 per cent); only three countries are below the average ESCAP level: Bangladesh (82 per cent), Sri Lanka (60 per cent) and India (32 per cent).

4. Household equipment and operation

71. For the group as a whole, Hong Kong's per capita level is the highest (714 per cent of the average ESCAP level), almost 34 times as high as that of India (21 per cent). Especially high is Hong Kong's consumption level in furniture (1,282 per cent), more than three times higher than the levels in the Islamic Republic of Iran (401 per cent) and Thailand (399 per cent) and more than four times higher than in Japan (316 per cent). Surprisingly high is the furniture consumption in Sri Lanka (175 per cent); it is relatively high in Bangladesh (69 per cent) while the lowest level can be observed for India (26 per cent). The differences in household appliances consumption are large: the level of the Hong Kong per capita consumption (766 per cent of the ESCAP average level) is almost 70 times higher than the level of India

(11 per cent). Japanese consumption is also relatively high (723 per cent), while the levels of Sri Lanka (15 per cent), Bangladesh (18 per cent), and Thailand (26 per cent) are relatively low.

5. Medical care

72. In total medical consumption the per capita differences are relatively large. Japan's level is about 75 times higher than that of Bangladesh. Especially low in Bangladesh is the consumption of pharmaceutical products (only 3 per cent of the average ESCAP level). Similarly low is the pharmaceutical product consumption in Pakistan (18 per cent); the Indian level is relatively high (65 per cent) and exceeds even the level of the Philippines (60 per cent). In India, however the consumption of health services is very low (8 per cent of the average ESCAP level), less than 1 per cent of the Japanese per capita consumption. Relatively low levels of health services consumption can also be found in Bangladesh (11 per cent), the Philippines (17 per cent), Pakistan (27 per cent), Thailand (30 per cent) and Sri Lanka (34 per cent).

6. Transport and communication

73. In the consumption of transport equipment the per capita differences are extremely large: the Japanese level is more than 1,000 times larger than that in Bangladesh. For this analytical category, four groups of countries/areas can be distinguished: (a) Japan, the only country with strikingly high consumption (almost 9 times as high as the average ESCAP level); (b), Hong Kong and Pakistan with consumption around the average ESCAP level (139 per cent and 96 per cent); (c) five countries in the 20 - 50 per cent range of the ESCAP level: the Philippines (49 per cent), Thailand (30 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (29 per cent), the Republic of Korea (29 per cent) and Sri Lanka (19 per cent); and (d), two countries with extremely low level of consumption, India (4 per cent) and Bangladesh (1 per cent).

74. As regards operation of transport equipment the Islamic Republic of Iran (268 per cent) was a distant second after Japan (631 per cent), followed by Hong Kong (210 per cent), Pakistan (136.0 per cent) and Thailand (117 per cent). Again India (18 per cent) and Bangladesh (12 per cent) occupy the last two places. Purchased transport services are highest in Hong Kong (768 per cent), followed by five countries more or less around the same level: Thailand (284 per cent), Japan (281 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (276 per cent), the Republic of Korea (262 per cent) and Sri Lanka (226 per cent). Strikingly, the lowest purchased transport consumption can be found in the Philippines (5 per cent of the average ESCAP level), around one tenth of the Indian and the Bangladesh per capita consumption.

75. As to the communication services, the differences are, again, very large. The Japanese per capita consumption is almost 50 times higher than the Pakistani consumption and more than 1700 times higher than the extremely low Bangladesh consumption. The relatively high the Republic of Korean consumption (384 per cent of the average ESCAP level) and the relatively low consumption of Thailand (42 per cent), the Philippines (30 per cent) and India should also be noted.

7. Recreation and education

76. In the recreational equipment consumption the per capita differences are extremely large. The per capita level of Hong Kong (1,994 per cent of the average ESCAP level) is more than 500 times higher than the Indian level (3.8 per cent), more than 700 times higher than the Philippines level (2.8 per cent), and almost 1,200 times higher than the Bangladesh level (1.7 per cent). Sri Lanka's (15 per cent), Pakistan's (30 per cent) and the Islamic Republic of Iran's (30 per cent) levels are also relatively low. Apart from Hong Kong only Japan (817 per cent) and the Republic of Korea (202 per cent) are above the average ESCAP level.

77. In the recreational services consumption, again Hong Kong's very high level is striking (1,084 per cent of the average ESCAP level). Here again Japan occupies the second (736 per cent) and the Republic of Korea the third (116 per cent) place, followed by Pakistan (106 per cent) and Sri Lanka (102 per cent). On the other end the Islamic Republic of Iran's last position (13 per cent) is to be noted, preceded by India (16 per cent), Bangladesh (17 per cent), the Philippines (23 per cent) and Thailand (36 per cent). In the books, newspaper, magazine consumption, Japan (813 per cent) and Hong Kong (708 per cent) occupy the first two places, followed by Thailand (123 per cent) and the Republic of Korea (106 per cent). Especially low is the per capita consumption in Pakistan (15 per cent), India (12 per cent) and Bangladesh (4 per cent).

78. In the per capita educational services consumption the differences are somewhat smaller than in the preceding groups, though the Japanese level (522 per cent) is still more than 20 times higher than the Pakistani consumption (23 per cent). The relatively high level of the Republic of Korea (225 per cent), Thailand (170 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (141 per cent) and the Philippines (121 per cent) should also be mentioned.

8. Restaurant, cafe services

79. Hong Kong (1,112 per cent of the ESCAP average level) and Japan (752 per cent) occupy the first two places, followed by Thailand (143 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (141 per cent) and the Republic of Korea (126 per cent). The Philippines level is also relatively high, though below the ESCAP average level (82 per cent). Strikingly low is the restaurant, cafe services consumption in Sri Lanka (15 per cent), India (6 per cent), and especially in Bangladesh (1 per cent).

9. Capital formation

80. Substantial differences between the construction and producer durable indices can be found for the Islamic Republic of Iran (225 per cent for construction and 65 per cent for producer durable) and for Sri Lanka (155 per cent for construction and 27 per cent for producer durable). Producer durable indices are substantially higher in the Philippines (39 per cent versus 18 per cent) and in Japan (756 per cent versus 629 per cent).

Table 7. Differences in capital formation according to the main types of goods (average ESCAP level = 100)

	Japan	*Hong Kong*	*Iran (Islamic Rep. of)*	*Rep. of Korea*	*Thailand*	*Sri Lanka*	*Philip-pines*	*Pakistan*	*Bangla-desh*	*India*
Domestic capital formation	652.7	392.6	183.4	229.0	76.4	97.1	23.0	23.4	12.2	25.8
Construction	629.0	396.2	224.7	275.5	82.5	155.0	18.0	23.3	13.3	23.0
Producer durable	755.8	427.0	64.8	194.7	69.5	27.1	39.4	19.4	10.6	19.9
Change in stocks	252.3	156.8	520.9	26.9	63.2	5.5	-29.0	46.9	11.5	84.8
Net foreign balance	1200.0	1097.0	137.0	36.1	-14.2	-144.5	56.4	-82.8	-45.4	-23.3

81. There are a number of characteristic differences in respect of the internal structure of the producer durable capital formation. The relatively high level of the Japanese transport equipment level (831 per cent of the average ESCAP level), the relatively low level of the electrical machinery level in Thailand (20 per cent) and of the transport equipment level in the Philippines (4 per cent) and in Bangladesh (3 per cent) are most noteworthy in this respect. However, all these differences should be accepted with caution only because of the relatively large comparability differences in respect of these items.

D. Purchasing power parities and deviations from exchange rates

1. Relation between PPPs and exchanges rates

82. Although the compilation of PPPs is basically a means only for the calculation of the level of GDP at comparable prices, it is also of primary importance to analyse the actual PPPs of currencies at the global level of GDP and separately for the various groups of goods and services. In addition, great attention should be devoted to the deviations of PPPs from the official exchanges rates since this deviation index shows the extent to which a currency is over-, or undervalued, in the financial market. In this report, as in other reports on the ICP comparison, the ratio of PPPs to the official exchange rate is interpreted as a price index according to which the price level of a country is low if the PPP is below the official exchange rate since for a given amount of money converted into local currency more goods and services can be purchased than for the same amount in the domestic economy. Thus, a country seems to be expensive if the actual price level (PPP) is higher than the exchange rate.

83. Since the PPPs and exchange rates have only meaning in the context of two given currencies, the selection of currency as a basis for the calculation of PPPs and exchange rates is a fundamental question. As will be shown below, a given country may be considered "expensive" in relation to another country. Therefore, this report will show the PPPs and exchange rates for all pairs of countries/areas in the ESCAP region. However, in addition to that kind of comparison, it is also of great interest to demonstrate what is the ratio of PPPs and exchange rates of the currencies of ESCAP countries/areas in a world level context. For this purpose again the United States dollar seems to be the best "numeraire" because all currencies in the world are usually judged in comparison with the dollar. So first the PPPs and exchange rates of the 10 ESCAP countries/areas are determined in relation to the United States dollar, as shown in table 8 below.

Table 8. Purchasing power parities for GDP and exchange rates between currencies of 10 ESCAP countries/areas and the United States

	PPP for GDP	*Exchange rate (ER)*	*Price level:*
	in national currency per United States dollar		*PPP:ER = 100*
Japan	222.3088	238.050	93.3
Hong Kong	4.6879	7.791	60.2
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	69.2775	87.967	78.8
Republic of Korea	460.3033	870.027	52.9
Thailand	8.1077	27.134	29.9
Sri Lanka	5.2968	27.160	19.5
Philippines	6.3071	18.738	33.7
Pakistan	3.7672	15.928	23.7
Bangladesh	6.0849	31.000	19.6
India	4.6752	12.369	37.8

84. As can be seen from the ratio of PPPs and exchange rates, all currencies of the ESCAP countries/areas are "undervalued" according to the exchange rate quotations since much more national currency (in some countries 4-5 times more currency) is paid for one United States dollar than the national prices deviate from the prices of the United States. Even in the most developed country of the region, in Japan the price level (PPP) is 7 per cent below the exchange rate in relation to the United States dollar.[1]

85. After comparing the PPPs and exchange rates of the ESCAP countries/areas with United States prices and United States dollar, table 9 below makes possible the comparison of PPPs and exchange rates between any pair of countries/areas in the region. It is important to consider that the exchange rates

[1] Because of the extremely great fluctuation of the exchange rates since 1985, mainly that of the United States dollar, the relative price levels of the individual ESCAP countries/areas are today much different from those shown in table 8 above.

between any two countries/areas in the ESCAP region are derived from table 8. above, i.e. from the rates of the individual countries/areas to the United States dollar. (These rates may deviate to some extent from the direct quotations of each other's currency; however, the derived exchange rates satisfy the consistency between the comparison of relative price levels.)

Table 9. Purchasing power parities and exchange rates between pairs of ESCAP countries and areas

	Japan			*Hong Kong*		
	PPP for GDP in national currency per yen	*Exchange rate (ER) in national currency per yen*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*	*PPP for GDP in national currency per Hong Kong dollar*	*Exchange rate (ER) in national currency per Hong Kong dollar*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*
Japan	1.0000	1.0000	100.0	47.3700	30.5545	155.0
Hong Kong	0.0211	0.0327	64.4	1.0000	1.0000	100.0
Iran (IslamicRepublic of)	0.3119	0.3695	84.4	14.7780	11.2910	130.9
Republic of Korea	2.0727	3.6547	56.7	98.1900	111.6703	87.9
Thailand	0.0365	0.1140	32.0	1.7295	3.4828	49.7
Sri Lanka	0.0238	0.1141	20.9	1.1299	3.4861	32.4
Philippines	0.0284	0.0787	36.0	1.344	2.4051	55.9
Pakistan	0.0170	0.0669	25.3	0.8036	2.0444	39.3
Bangladesh	0.0274	0.1302	21.0	1.2980	3.9789	32.6
India	0.0211	0.0520	40.5	0.9973	1.5876	62.8

	Iran (Islamic Republic of)			*Republic of Korea*		
	PPP for GDP in national currency per Iranian rial	*Exchange rate (ER) in national currency per Iranian rial*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*	*PPP for GDP in national currency per won*	*Exchange rate (ER) in national currency per won*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*
Japan	3.2055	2.7061	118.5	0.4824	0.2736	176.4
Hong Kong	0.0677	0.0886	76.4	0.0102	0.0090	113.7
Iran (IslamicRepublic of)	1.0000	1.0000	100.0	0.1505	0.1011	148.9
Republic of Korea	6.6443	9.8902	67.2	1.0000	1.0000	100.0
Thailand	0.1170	0.3085	37.9	0.0176	0.0312	56.5
Sri Lanka	0.0765	0.3088	24.8	0.0115	0.0321	36.9
Philippines	0.0910	0.2130	42.7	0.0137	0.0215	63.6
Pakistan	0.0544	0.1811	30.0	0.0082	0.0183	44.7
Bangladesh	0.0878	0.3524	24.9	0.0132	0.0356	37.1
India	0.0675	0.1406	48.0	0.0102	0.0142	71.4

	Thailand			*Sri Lanka*		
	PPP for GDP in national currency per baht	*Exchange rate (ER) in national currency per baht*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*	*PPP for GDP in national currency per Sri Lanka rupee*	*Exchange rate (ER) in national currency per Sri Lanka rupee*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*
Japan	27.3895	8.7731	312.2	41.9245	8.7646	478.3
Hong Kong	0.5782	0.2871	201.4	0.8850	0.2869	308.5
Iran (Islamic Repubic of)	8.5447	3.2419	263.6	13.0790	3.2389	403.8
Republic of Korea	56.7736	32.0633	177.1	86.9015	32.0330	271.3
Thailand	1.0000	1.0000	100.0	1.5307	0.9991	153.2
Sri Lanka	0.6533	1.0009	65.3	1.0000	1.0000	100.0
Philippines	0.7779	0.6906	112.6	1.1907	0.6899	172.6
Philippines	0.7779	0.6906	112.6	1.1907	0.6899	172.6
Pakistan	0.4646	0.5870	79.2	0.7112	0.5864	121.3
Bangladesh	0.7505	1.1424	65.7	1.1488	1.1414	100.6
India	0.5766	0.4558	126.5	0.8826	0.4554	193.8

Table 9. (*continued*)

	Philippines			*Pakistan*		
	PPP for GDP in national currency per Philippines peso	*Exchange rate (ER)*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*	*PPP for GDP in national currency per Pakistan rupee*	*Exchange rate (ER)*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*
Japan	35.2089	12.7041	277.1	58.9472	14.9495	394.4
Hong Kong	0.7433	0.4158	178.8	1.2444	0.4891	254.4
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	10.9841	4.6946	234.0	18.3897	5.5229	333.0
Republic of Korea	72.9820	46.4307	157.2	122.1877	54.6225	223.7
Thailand	1.2855	1.4481	88.8	2.1522	1.7036	126.3
Sri Lanka	0.8398	1.4495	57.9	1.4060	1.7052	82.5
Philippines	1.0000	1.0000	100.0	1.6742	1.1764	142.3
Pakistan	0.5973	0.8500	70.3	1.0000	1.0000	100.0
Bangladesh	0.9648	1.6544	58.3	1.6152	1.9462	83.0
India	0.7413	0.6601	112.3	1.2410	0.7766	159.8

	Bangladesh			*India*		
	PPP for GDP in national currency per taka	*Exchange rate (ER)*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*	*PPP for GDP in national currency per Indian rupee*	*Exchange rate (ER)*	*Price level: PPP:ER=100*
Japan	36.4946	7.6790	475.3	47.4927	19.2457	246.8
Hong Kong	0.7704	0.2513	306.5	1.0027	0.6299	159.2
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	11.3852	2.8377	401.2	14.8180	7.1120	208.4
Republic of Korea	75.6471	28.0656	269.5	98.4558	70.3391	140.0
Thailand	1.3324	0.8753	152.2	1.7342	2.1938	79.1
Sri Lanka	0.8705	0.8761	99.4	1.1330	2.1958	51.6
Philippines	1.0365	0.6045	171.5	1.3490	1.5149	89.1
Pakistan	0.6191	0.5138	120.5	0.8058	1.2877	62.6
Bangladesh	1.0000	1.0000	100.0	1.3015	2.5062	51.9
India	0.7683	0.3990	192.6	1.0000	1.0000	100.0

86. The general price level differences among the countries/areas in the region are relatively large. The most expensive, Japan, is about five times as expensive as the least expensive, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh; about four times as expensive as Pakistan, about three times as expensive as the Philippines and Thailand, two and one half times as expensive as India, and nearly twice as expensive as the Republic of Korea and Hong Kong. The Islamic Republic of Iran is the only country relatively near the Japanese price level. One possible interpretation of the price level differences is the following: imagine people from the ESCAP region, with average ESCAP expenditure structure, arriving in each country/area with a given amount of convertible currencies. From the point of this illustration it is irrelevant in which currency(ies) the amount is available (United States dollars, Japanese yen or Republic of Korea won); the only requirements are that the same amount is available in each country/area and that this amount is converted into the local currency at the official exchange rate. Under these conditions, the average ESCAP spender would be able to buy almost five times more, in terms of quantity, in Bangladesh and in Sri Lanka than in Japan, and more than four times more in the two cheapest countries than in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

87. The picture does not change much if, instead of the GDP total prices, only the household consumption prices are taken as the purchasing power basis. For most comparisons, Japan's most expensive price level becomes even more accentuated; the order of the countries/areas remains the same with one exception only; in the household consumption column Bangladesh, instead of Sri Lanka, occupies the place of least expensive country.

88. Large price level differences in a heterogeneous region such as the ESCAP region are not unexpected. Previous ICP studies have proved several times that there is a strong correlation between the general economic development level and the price level: in general, the more developed the countries/areas are, the higher their price levels. Looking at the ESCAP comparison results with this view, the following observations can be made:

(a) The price levels of India, Japan and especially of the Islamic Republic of Iran are relatively high in comparison with their general economic development level.

(b) The price levels of Hong Kong, Thailand, Pakistan and especially Sri Lanka are relatively low in comparison with their general economic development levels.

2. Comparison of ESCAP and OECD price structure

89. As pointed out above, regional average prices were used for the weighting of quantities consumed or invested in the countries/areas belonging to a given region. It is of great importance to know to what extent the average Asian price structure deviates from the average price structure of the OECD countries, representing the most economically developed part of the world. Since Japan took part in both the OECD and ESCAP comparisons, the components of Japan's GDP are available in the two price structures, as shown in table 10 below. The most striking deviations between them are the very low relative prices of government final consumption and medical care in the Asian countries, which is counterbalanced by the very high prices of recreational goods and services and education (mainly of equipment for recreation) and for all types of investment goods.

Table 10. Per capita GDP of Japan according to Asian and OECD average price structure

	Per capita GDP of Japan in United States dollars		
	According to Asian average price structure	*According to OECD average price structure*	*Ratio between Asian and OECD price structures*
Consumption of households	7 127	7 773	0.916
Food, beverage and tobacco	1 469	1 261	1.165
Clothing and footwear	461	444	1.038
Gross rents, fuel, power	1 297	1 572	0.825
House furnishing	386	377	1.024
Medical care	715	1 203	0.594
Transport, communication	620	610	1.016
Recreation, education	1 041	1 073	0.970
Miscellaneous goods and services	1 080	1 198	0.902
Government final consumption	357	667	05350
Gross fixed capital form.	3 605	2 836	1.271
Construction	1 989	1 635	1.217
Producer durable	1 616	1 202	1.344
Change in stocks	92	78	1.179
Net foreign balance	623	441	1.413
Gross domestic product	11 804	11 795	1.000

3. Relative prices of the main expenditure categories

90. The ratios between the two sets of components can also be used as correction factors for linking the individual per.capita items of two countries, one of which belong to Asia and the other to OECD.

91. Table 11 below presents the relative price indices of the ESCAP countries/areas for the main expenditure categories: household consumption, government consumption and capital formation (excluding net exports). The deviations from 100 in each column indicate which aggregates are relatively more expensive (higher than 100) and which are less expensive (lower than 100) than the average price level of the given country/area which is taken for the GDP total as 100.

Table 11. Relative price indices of the main expenditure categories

Country or area	*GDP*	*Household consumption*	*Government consumption*	*Capital formation excl.of net export*
Japan	100.0	104.4	168.8	90.9
Hong Kong	100.0	95.6	198.6	99.2
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	100.0	96.9	152.3	93.6
Republic of Korea	100.0	101.4	126.9	92.0
Thailand	100.0	97.5	76.7	135.8
Sri Lanka	100.0	130.7	66.2	82.1
Philippines	100.0	97.1	56.1	189.7
Pakistan	100.0	108.0	60.0	184.5
Bangladesh	100.0	106.3	48.5	211.7
India	100.0	94.9	83.2	132.2

92. Government consumption prices deviate the most from the general price level. In general, higher per capita GDP countries/areas (Japan, Hong Kong, the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Republic of Korea) have relatively higher government consumption price levels, while in all other countries/areas the government consumption price level is substantially lower than the general price level. The highest and lowest government relative price indices should be mentioned particularly: in Hong Kong the relative price level is almost twice as high, in Bangladesh, less than half as high as the general price level.

93. Capital formation relative prices are negatively correlated with the economic development level; in the four relatively developed countries/areas of the region, capital formation goods are relatively cheap. In the less developed countries of the region capital formation is relatively more expensive, especially in Bangladesh (212 per cent), the Philippines (190 per cent) and Pakistan (185 per cent). Sri Lanka seems to be an exception to the general rule, with the lowest capital formation.

94. Household consumption relative price level deviates only to a relatively small extent from the general price level of the given country: with one exception only, all deviations are within the 10 per cent limit. The only exception is Sri Lanka, where consumption relative prices are almost one third higher than the general price level. The reader should be reminded, however, that Sri Lanka has the lowest absolute price level (around one fifth of the Japanese price level) in the region; thus the relatively high consumption prices in Sri Lanka are still relatively low in the region, taking the official exchange rate as a basis.

Relative price level by analytical categories

95. Relative price levels will be presented for household consumption analytical categories only. High and low relative levels will be expressed with reference to the total household consumption price level (which, as has been shown above, does not differ much from the total GDP price level, the only exception being Sri Lanka). Thus, for instance, the 113 per cent meat relative price index for Japan means that meat prices in that country are 13 per cent higher than household consumption prices in general, in a comparison

of the Japanese prices with the ESCAP region prices in general. (See annex table A.8/ii, where all analytical category relative price indices are presented.)

96. Food prices in general do not differ much from household consumption prices in general. The highest relative level can be found for the Republic of Korea (111 per cent) and Bangladesh (108 per cent), the lowest for Hong Kong (82 per cent) and Thailand (84 per cent). Bread and cereals relative prices are strikingly low in Thailand (59 per cent) and Hong Kong (70 per cent) and relatively high in Japan (113 per cent), India (109 per cent) and Bangladesh (107 per cent). Meat prices are relatively high in the relatively developed countries/areas of the region, in the Islamic Republic of Iran (122 per cent), in the Republic of Korea (119 per cent) and in Japan (113 per cent), but not in Hong Kong, where they are strikingly low (75 per cent). Low meat relative price levels can be found in the least developed countries, India (74 per cent), Bangladesh (76 per cent), Pakistan (69 per cent), and especially in Sri Lanka (61 per cent). Fish relative prices are especially high in the Islamic Republic of Iran (200 per cent), relatively high also in the Republic of Korea (134 per cent), Japan (124 per cent) and Bangladesh (112 per cent), while relatively low in Pakistan (83 per cent), India (62 per cent) and the Philippines (75 per cent). Milk, cheese and egg prices are relatively low in Hong Kong (77 per cent) and Japan (87 per cent), around the average consumption price level in India (100 per cent) and the Islamic Republic of Iran (103 per cent), while in all other countries/areas they are relatively high, especially in Bangladesh (146 per cent) and the Republic of Korea (137 per cent). Oil and fat prices are relatively low in Japan (52 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (62 per cent) and Hong Kong (67 per cent) and relatively high in India (114 per cent), Sri Lanka (119 per cent) and especially in Bangladesh (157 per cent). Fruit and vegetable prices are cheapest in Thailand (80 per cent), relatively cheap also in India (91 per cent), Bangladesh (92 per cent) and Hong Kong (93 per cent) while relatively most expensive in the Philippines (138 per cent), in Sri Lanka (119 per cent) and in Japan (118 per cent).

97. Alcoholic beverages relative price levels differ to a very large extent among the countries of the ESCAP region. In Bangladesh they are two and one half times higher than the general household consumption price level (247 per cent), in Thailand (186 per cent) and Sri Lanka (174 per cent) almost double the general level, and in India 148 per cent. On the other end, in Japan, Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea and the Philippines, alcoholic beverages are relatively cheap, having a 14-20 per cent lower relative price level than consumption goods and services in general. Non-alcoholic beverages are most expensive in Bangladesh (134 per cent), India (123 per cent) and Thailand (120 per cent), while least expensive in Hong Kong (87 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (89 per cent) and the Republic of Korea (90 per cent). Tobacco price levels also differ widely, and are most expensive in the Islamic Republic of Iran (230 per cent), Sri Lanka (195 per cent) and Thailand (161 per cent), while least expensive in Japan (70 per cent), the Republic of Korea (87 per cent) and Hong Kong (89 per cent).

98. Clothing relative prices are highest in Thailand (148 per cent), relatively high also in India (119 per cent), and lowest in Pakistan (66 per cent), Sri Lanka (69 per cent) and the Republic of Korea (83 per cent). Footwear is most expensive in India (138 per cent) and Pakistan (133 per cent), relatively expensive also in Thailand (117 per cent) and cheapest in the Philippines (70 per cent) and relatively cheap also in Hong Kong (81 per cent) and Japan (86 per cent).

99. Gross rents are most expensive in Hong Kong (222 per cent), in the Philippines (219 per cent) and Pakistan (206 per cent), the least expensive in India (67 per cent) and Japan (92 per cent). Fuel and power prices are relatively the highest in the Republic of Korea (130 per cent) and in Hong Kong (125 per cent), relatively the lowest in the Islamic Republic of Iran (38 per cent) and in Pakistan (79 per cent).

100. Furniture relative price level is the highest in Japan (126 per cent) and the Philippines (115 per cent), the lowest in Sri Lanka (49 per cent) and in Thailand (69 per cent). Household textiles are most expensive in the Philippines (242 per cent) and in Bangladesh (207 per cent), the least expensive in the Republic of Korea (46 per cent) and in Hong Kong (88 per cent). Household appliances are surprisingly the cheapest in Bangladesh (64 per cent), relatively cheap also in Hong Kong (74 per cent) and Japan (79 per cent),

while most expensive in Sri Lanka (205 per cent), India (195 per cent), Pakistan (165 per cent) and the Philippines (154 per cent).

101. Medical care price level is difficult to compare, owing to the differences in institutional arrangements; the relative price indices have to be interpreted, therefore, with caution. Pharmaceutical products are the most expensive in the Republic of Korea (254 per cent) the Philippines (184 per cent) and Hong Kong (144 per cent), while relatively least expensive in the Islamic Republic of Iran (81 per cent and Bangladesh (82 per cent). In Bangladesh the health services have the highest relative price level (13 per cent) followed by Hong Kong (129 per cent), while the lowest relative level can be observed i Pakistan (29 per cent) and in the Republic of Korea (89 per cent).

102. Transport equipment is relatively cheap only in Japan (61 per cent). In all other countries it i expensive, costing most in the Islamic Republic of Iran (660 per cent), in Bangladesh (479 per cent), in th Philippines (338 per cent), Pakistan (336 per cent) and Sri Lanka (300 per cent). As to transport operation cost, the highest relative price levels can be observed in India (163 per cent), Hong Kong (159 per cent) and the Philippines (150 per cent), while the lowest relative price levels can be found in Bangladesh (59 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (72 per cent) and Pakistan (77 per cent). Purchased transport services are the most expensive in the Philippines (210 per cent) and Japan (145 per cent), and cheapest in the Islamic Republic of Iran (43 per cent) and Pakistan (57 per cent). Communication services are the most expensive in Bangladesh (203 per cent), Thailand (170 per cent), the Philippines (148 per cent) and India (139 per cent), and the cheapest in Sri Lanka (62 per cent), the Republic of Korea (78 per cent), the Islamic Republic of Iran (86 per cent) and Hong Kong (87 per cent).

103. Equipment for recreation is relatively cheap only in Japan (84 per cent) and the Republic of Korea (94 per cent). On the other end, in six of the 10 countries/areas, namely the Islamic Republic of Iran (288 per cent), Sri Lanka (284 per cent), Bangladesh (278 per cent), India (256 per cent), Pakistan (248 per cent) and the Philippines (206 per cent) these goods are at least twice as expensive as the price level in general. Recreational services are relatively most expensive in Pakistan (148 per cent) and Thailand (140 per cent), and relatively less expensive in Sri Lanka (47 per cent), the Philippines (47 per cent), Bangladesh (62 per cent) Hong Kong (74 per cent) and the Islamic Republic of Iran (76 per cent). Books, newspapers and magazines are relatively most expensive in Sri Lanka (200 per cent) and Pakistan (196 per cent), while relatively least expensive in Japan (90 per cent). The price level of the educational services is again difficult to compare; however, it can be stated with some certainty that the levels are relatively expensive in Japan, Hong Kong, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Republic of while relatively cheap in all other countries.

104. Restaurants, cafes and similar catering services are relatively most expensive in India (123 per cent) and Hong Kong (121 per cent) while relatively less expensive in Bangladesh (52 per cent), Pakistan (56 per cent) and the Islamic Republic of Iran (65 per cent). However, it should be noted that caution advised in the many quality differences of these services could not have been taken into account in the purchasing power comparison.

E. Correlation between the quantity and price structure in the region

105. Most of the international comparisons are dominated by the negative correlation between the quantity and price structure: what is relatively cheap in a given country is consumed/used, in general, in a relatively larger quantity and what is relatively expensive is consumed/used generally in a relatively smaller quantity. The ESCAP comparison is not an exception to this general rule; one evidence of the dominance of the negative correlation is the fact that the Laspeyres indices always exceed the corresponding Paasche indices, and the ratio of the two indices is always relatively high. In some cases, as in the Philippines versus Hong Kong or the Bangladesh versus Hong Kong comparisons, the Laspeyres indices are more than twice as high as the corresponding Paasche indices.

106. In this section, proceeding from one country area to another, examples will be given in which the negative correlation between quantity and price indices prevails. This will be done by comparing the relative quantity index (the quantity index of the particular group as a percentage of the GDP quantity index) with the relative price index (i.e., the price index of the particular group as percentage of the GDP price index). Examples will be given also of some cases where positive correlation prevails, e.g. where in spite of the relatively low price level the given good or service is consumed only in relatively low quantities, or where in spite of the relatively high price level the consumption quantity level also is high.[1]

107. For Japan the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Bread and cereals	29	118
Meat	51	118
Alcoholic beverages	130	87
Fuel and power	70	121
Furniture	61	132
Appliances	139	83
Transport equipment	171	63
Purchased transport services	54	152
Positive correlation		
Fats and oils	19	55
Sugar	78	90
Education	104	127

For Hong Kong the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Meat	152	72
Footwear	181	77
Gross rents	52	212
Fuel and power	46	120
Furniture	286	76
Appliances	169	71
Pharmaceutical products	84	137
Health services	72	123
Transport equipment	31	142
Operation costs	57	152
Recreational services	240	71

[1] It should be noted that in the case of negative correlations any bias of the PPPs(negative price indices) automatically influences the relative quantity indices in the opposite direction.

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Positive correlation		
Food	50	78
Bread and cereals	22	67
Milk, cheese and eggs	27	74
Oils and fats	43	65
Alcoholic beverages	82	77
Books, newspaper, etc.	157	128
Restaurants, cafes, etc.	246	116

109. For the Islamic Republic of Iran the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation ca be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Fish	11	193
Tobacco	47	223
Pharmaceutical products	158	79
Operation costs	131	69
Transport equipment	14	640
Purchased transport services	135	42
Equipment for recreation	15	279
Education	69	124
Construction	11	077
Producer durable	32	160
Positive correlation		
Meat	288	118
Gross rents	132	133
Household textiles	187	123
Recreational services	6	73
Restaurants, cafes, etc.	69	63

110. For the Republic of Korea, the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Fish	71	136
Milk, cheese and eggs	46	139
Gross rents	37	125
Household textiles	297	46
Pharmaceutical products	61	257
Communication	219	80
Books, newspapers, etc.	60	122
Construction	156	83

111. For Thailand the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Bread and cereals	128	57
Milk, cheese and eggs	45	127
Tobacco	71	157
Furniture	344	67
Appliances	22	139
Transport equipment	26	199
Communication	36	166
Equipment for recreation	53	150
Recreational services	31	137
Education	145	59
ɔsitive correlation		
ɔn alcoholic beverages	281	117
coholic beverages	146	181
thing	155	145
aurants and cafes, etc.	123	112

112. For Sri Lanka the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Milk, cheese and eggs	53	163
Gross rents	11	248
Furniture	217	64
Appliances	18	268
Transport equipment	23	392
Equipment for recreation	18	372
Recreational services	124	61
Producer durable	33	325
Positive correlation		
Meat	40	80
Fruits and vegetables	167	156
Alcoholic beverages	110	228
Tobacco	135	255
Health services	42	51

113. For the Philippines the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Bread, cereals	84	291
Fish	445	73
Fruits and vegetables	90	134
Footwear	174	68
Gross rents	64	213
Household textiles	16	235
Appliances	81	149
Pharmaceutical products	75	179
Transport equipment	61	328
Operation costs	34	146
Purchased transport services	7	204
Communication	37	144
Construction	23	288
Positive correlation		
Milk, cheese	110	126
Recreational services	29	46
Producer durable	50	116

114. For Pakistan the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Meat	155	75
Clothing	129	72
Gross rents	51	222
Fuel and power	197	86
Operation costs	229	83
Communication	24	137
Equipment for recreation	50	268
Books, newspapers, etc.	24	212
Positive correlations		
Milk, cheese and eggs	161	130
Household appliances	126	178
Health services	46	31
Transport equipment	164	362
Recreational services	180	160
Education	30	48
Restaurants, cafes, etc.	55	60

115. For Bangladesh the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Meat	187	81
Milk, cheese and eggs	70	155
Non-alcoholic beverages	3	143
Alcoholic beverages	3	263
Household textiles	56	220
Health services	31	145
Transport equipment	2	510
Purchased transport services	157	54
Equipment for recreation	5	295
Positive correlations		
Household appliances	50	68
Operation costs	32	63
Recreational services	47	66
Education	63	41
Restaurants, cafes, etc.	2	56

For India the following cases for strong negative or positive correlation can be observed:

Analytical category	*Relative quantity indices*	*Relative price indices*
	(Percentage)	
Negative correlations		
Non-alcoholic beverages	11	117
Alcoholic beverages	65	140
Footwear	86	131
Household appliances	33	185
Transport equipment	13	130
Operation costs	56	154
Communication	47	132
Equipment for recreation	12	243
Restaurants,cafes,etc.	19	117
Producer durable	60	181
Positive correlations		
Meat	77	70
Fish	66	59
Oils and fats	320	109
Clothing	137	113
Recreational services	48	81

F. Nepal in the ESCAP comparison

117. As mentioned above, Nepal was able to provide information only on household and government consumption for the ESCAP comparison. Therefore, a separate round of compilations was carried out in order to obtain comparable prices for the consumption items of Nepal and the other 10 countries/areas. The new round of calculations reflects the effect of two factors: (a) the inclusion of Nepal's quantities and prices in the compilation of average Asian prices, and (b) the exclusion of the influence on PPPs of investment goods and other items of capital formation. As is known, according to the Geary-Khamis method the PPP for an item or a sub-aggregate of GDP is affected not only by the weights and prices of the given item but also by prices of other items,; for example, the PPPs for consumption would be considerably different if prices and quantities of investment were left out of the comparison. Since Nepal's share in total final consumption of 11 ESCAP countries/areas was only 0.46 per cent, the inclusion of Nepal's data into the comparison could basically not change any results obtained previously for the 10 ESCAP countries/areas. Much more, but still negligible, was the influence of the second factor, namely the reduction of the coverage of the comparison. To avoid proliferation of "official" results and confusion in the present report all results of the 10 "full-participation" ESCAP countries/areas are maintained in the original magnitude. As shown below in table 12 the per capita levels of global consumption are almost the same in the 10 "full-participation" countries/areas, independent of whether they are calculated at average prices of 10 or 11 countries/areas. The difference is much below the limit of statistical error. So, all data for Nepal are taken from the Geary-Khamis compilation for 11 countries/areas and without any changes these data are contrasted with the results of the other 10 ESCAP countries/areas obtained from a Geary-Khamis compilation for 10 countries/areas. However, for showing the effect of the previously mentioned two factors on the ESCAP comparison, in annex table B.3 the per capita consumption of all 11 countries/areas is shown according to the average prices of the 11 countries/areas.

118. Per capita level of global consumption of Nepal was 579 Asian dollars in 1985, which was the lowest level among the countries/areas participating in the ESCAP comparison. It was only 8 per cent of the Japanese consumption level and was also below the consumption level of India by 6 per cent. In comparison with the United States, the Nepal level does not reach one twentieth of the former's magnitude. Table 12 below shows the per capita consumption level of the ESCAP countries/areas, indicating the small difference between the two sets of calculations. Therefore, all results of Nepal's global and detailed items are compared with the original data of the other countries/areas. (Nepal's data are contrasted with figures shown in the second column of the table.)

Table 12. Comparison of real per capita consumption for 11 ESCAP countries/areas, including Nepal

	Per capita total consumption in Asian dollar at average price of		*Nepal's per capita consumption in percentage of the other countries/areas*		
	10 countries/areas	*11 countries/areas*	*Total consumption*	*Consumption of household*	*Government consumption*
Japan	7 484	7 458	7.7	6.8	25.6
Hong Kong	7 405	7 418	7.8	6.9	27.7
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	3 501	3 568	16.5	15.5	26.3
Republic of Korea	2 656	2 697	21.8	20.3	36.5
Thailand	2 211	2 279	26.2	27.6	20.5
Sri Lanka	1 374	1 427	42.1	43.7	35.3
Philippines	1 629	1 682	35.5	34.8	40.1
Pakistan	1 252	1 301	46.3	51.4	30.2
Bangladesh	783	819	73.9	75.1	67.8
India	614	650	94.3	90.4	122.4
Nepal		579	100.0	100.0	100.0

119. The PPP of the Nepalese rupee is 3.8433 in relation to the Asian dollar in the sphere of global consumption. This price level is much below the official exchange rate, which is 18.247 rupees per United States dollar, i.e., Nepal's general price index is 21 per cent only, basically as low as that of Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Pakistan. Table 13 below shows the PPPs and exchange rates between Nepal and the other 10 ESCAP countries/areas. (The exchange rates for Nepal and the other countries/areas are derived from he exchange rates of each country/areas for the United States dollar.)

Table 13. Purchasing power parities and exchange rates of the Nepalese rupee in other ESCAP countries/areas

	PPP for consumption	*Exchange rate*	*Price index*
	currency unit per one Nepalese rupee		*(PPP/ER)*
n	62.386	13.029	478.8
; Kong	1.220	0.426	286.4
(Islamic Republic of)	18.107	4.815	376.0
,ublic of Korea	122.458	47.620	257.2
ıailand	1.910	1.485	128.6
ri Lanka	1.573	1.487	105.8
?hilippines	1.452	1.026	141.6
Pakistan	0.908	0.872	104.1
Bangladesh	1.460	1.697	86.0
India	1.074	0.677	158.6
Nepal	1.000	1.000	100.0

120. Annex table B.2 shows the level of Nepal's per capita consumption for all analytical categories and compares it with the ESCAP average and all the other countries/areas. There is only one group of consumption, namely bread and cereals, where per capita consumption of Nepal is above the ESCAP average (149 per cent). In the case of six analytical groups Nepal's per capita level exceeds 50 per cent of the ESCAP average: household textiles (69); clothing (51); footwear (58); fuel and power (56); pharmaceutical products (56) and government consumption (56). However, there are several items of consumption which practically cannot be found in Nepal or which have a consumption below 5 per cent of the ESCAP per capita average. These groups, in percentages, are: non-alcoholic beverage (0); household appliances (0); transport equipment (0); equipment for recreation (0.5); transport operation (0.6); health services (2); communication (2); fish (4); books and newspapers (4.8).

121. The price structure of Nepal can be compared with the help of relative price indices which indicate which items are relatively cheap and which are relatively expensive in comparison with the rest of the ESCAP region. Especially cheap in Nepal are education (45 per cent), health services (78 per cent), tobacco (81 per cent), restaurants and cafes (85 per cent), bread and cereals (93 per cent). Especially expensive are consumer durables, first of all transport equipment (800 per cent), transport operation costs (262 per cent), equipment for recreation (590 per cent), as well as alcoholic beverages (332 per cent), books, newspapers (187 per cent), gross rents (184 per cent), communication services (158 per cent), household textiles (153 per cent), milk, cheese and eggs (149 per cent) and furniture (142 per cent).

G. Similarity of the quantity and price structure among ESCAP countries/areas

122. The results of the comparison make it possible to measure the degree of similarities among ESCAP countries/areas both in respect of the quantity and the price structures. These results are presented in tables 14 to 17 below, each in the form of matrices. The figures in these matrices can be interpreted as some kind of distribution percentages, expressing the overlapping part of the structures. Their maximum value is 100: this would be the case if the quantiies or price structures between two countries/areas were entirely identical (in terms of the basic heading percentages), and their minimal value was 0, which would be the case if the structures between two countries/areas were entirely different, with no single basic heading common to both.

123. Tables 14 and 15 express similarities in respect of the quantity structures, the first for the GDP as a whole (covering 10 countries/areas) the second for the household consumption (covering 11 countries/areas). Tables 16 and 17 express similarities in respect of the price structures, again the first for the GDP as a total and the second for household consumption.

Table 14. Quantity structure similarity indices, GDP

	Japan	*Hong Kong*	*Iran (Islamic Rep. of)*	*Rep. of Korea*	*Thailand*	*Sri Lanka*	*Philip-pines*	*Pakistan*	*Bangla-desh*	*Indi*
Japan	100.0	59.2	51.0	61.0	45.3	36.9	38.1	35.9	31.7	4
Hong Kong	59.2	100.0	47.8	49.8	42.5	28.3	33.6	29.8	25.3	3
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	51.0	47.8	100.0	50.0	45.7	39.9	42.2	41.0	39.3	5.
Republic of Korea	61.0	49.8	50.0	100.0	55.5	53.0	48.1	37.5	39.1	48.
Thailand	45.3	42.5	45.7	55.5	100.0	56.0	57.1	47.6	49.3	53.9
Sri Lanka	36.9	28.3	39.9	53.0	56.0	100.0	43.0	38.8	48.3	56.6
Philippines	38.1	33.6	42.2	48.1	57.1	43.0	100.0	39.3	53.9	42.9
Pakistan	35.9	29.8	41.0	37.5	47.6	38.8	39.3	100.0	47.5	47.6
Bangladesh	31.7	25.3	39.3	39.1	49.3	48.3	53.9	47.5	100.0	50.9
India	42.7	30.2	52.0	48.7	53.9	56.6	42.9	47.6	50.9	100.0
Average	44.6	38.5	45.4	49.1	50.3	44.5	44.2	40.5	42.8	47.2

Table 15. Quantity structure similarity indices, household consumption

	Japan	*Hong Kong*	*Iran (Islamic Rep. of)*	*Rep. of Korea*	*Thailand*	*Sri Lanka*	*Philip-pines*	*Pakistan*	*Bangla-desh*	*India*	*Nepal*
Japan	100.0	51.5	53.1	55.0	44.0	39.6	33.9	40.9	33.8	38.2	29.6
Hong Kong	51.5	100.0	35.4	43.4	41.7	32.6	27.6	30.9	22.6	24.8	20.9
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	53.1	35.4	100.0	46.0	38.5	40.9	35.7	41.6	38.0	46.5	34.3
Republic of Korea	55.0	43.4	45.0	100.0	58.0	52.9	50.0	38.0	41.9	44.2	38.9
Thailand	44.0	41.7	38.5	58.0	100.0	54.0	53.2	34.8	43.6	45.8	37.0
Sri Lanka	39.6	32.6	40.9	52.9	54.0	100.0	46.1	35.8	52.6	39.3	47.7
Philippines	33.9	27.6	35.7	50.0	53.2	46.1	100.0	34.3	46.1	57.6	43.3
Pakistan	40.9	30.9	41.6	38.0	34.8	35.8	34.3	100.0	38.7	46.5	42.0
Bangladesh	33.8	22.6	38.0	41.9	43.6	52.6	46.1	38.7	100.0	48.5	47.7
India	38.2	24.8	46.5	44.2	45.8	39.3	57.6	46.5	48.5	100.0	52.4
Nepal	29.6	20.9	34.3	38.9	37.0	47.7	43.3	42.0	47.7	52.4	100.0
Average	42.0	33.1	41.0	45.8	45.1	44.2	42.8	38.4	41.4	44.4	39.4

Table 16. Price structure similarity indices, gross domestic product

	Japan	*Hong Kong*	*Iran (Islamic Rep. of)*	*Rep. of Korea*	*Thailand*	*Sri Lanka*	*Philip-pines*	*Pakistan*	*Bangla-desh*	*India*
Japan	100.0	79.5	74.7	79.1	68.4	56.8	61.5	64.8	62.7	71.8
Hong Kong	79.5	100.0	71.9	79.2	66.5	66.0	66.1	66.6	60.7	66.2
ran (Islamic Rep. of)	74.7	71.9	100.0	77.2	71.1	64.6	63.5	72.0	67.7	74.6
Republic of Korea	79.1	79.2	77.2	100.0	71.1	66.5	68.4	71.8	64.2	72.7
Thailand	68.4	66.5	71.1	71.1	100.0	70.4	68.8	77.2	76.9	81.2
Sri Lanka	56.8	66.0	64.6	66.5	70.4	100.0	65.9	73.2	68.0	70.3
Philippines	61.5	66.1	63.5	68.4	68.8	65.9	100.0	74.5	70.3	67.5
Pakistan	64.8	66.6	72.0	71.8	77.2	73.2	74.5	100.0	79.6	78.9
Bangladesh	62.7	60.7	67.7	64.2	76.9	68.0	70.3	79.6	100.0	76.5
India	71.8	66.2	74.6	72.7	81.2	70.3	67.5	78.9	76.5	100.0
Average	68.8	69.2	70.8	72.2	72.4	66.9	67.4	73.2	69.6	73.3

Table 17. Price structure similarity indices, household consumption

	Japan	*Hong Kong*	*Iran (Islamic Rep. of)*	*Rep. of Korea*	*Thailand*	*Sri Lanka*	*Philip-pines*	*Pakistan*	*Bangla-desh*	*India*	*Nepal*
Japan	100.0	75.5	71.6	77.57	2.9	68.4	61.2	66.5	67.8	75.0	65.2
Hong Kong	75.5	100.0	67.8	79.0	69.1	79.9	73.9	71.6	63.5	66.1	64.6
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	71.6	67.8	100.0	71.7	69.3	68.8	61.2	72.6	71.3	73.2	69.9
Republic of Korea	77.5	79.0	71.7	100.0	72.2	76.9	67.2	74.0	66.5	70.2	66.7
Thailand	72.9	69.1	69.3	72.2	100.0	75.0	65.6	73.3	75.7	61.6	74.9
Sri Lanka	68.4	79.9	68.8	76.9	75.0	100.0	78.1	79.5	71.3	70.9	70.5
Philippines	61.2	73.9	61.2	67.2	65.6	78.1	100.0	73.2	64.1	65.0	64.8
Pakistan	66.5	71.6	72.6	74.0	73.3	79.5	73.2	100.0	74.9	74.5	74.5
Bangladesh	67.8	63.5	71.3	66.5	75.7	71.3	65.1	74.9	100.0	78.0	82.9
India	75.0	66.1	73.2	70.2	61.6	70.9	65.0	74.5	78.0	100.0	74.2
Nepal	65.2	64.6	69.9	66.7	74.9	70.5	64.8	74.5	82.9	74.2	100.0
Average	70.2	71.1	69.7	72.2	71.0	73.9	67.5	73.5	71.7	70.9	70.8

124. The main conclusions which can be drawn from table 14 are the following:

(a) The degree of similarity of the quantity structure is substantially influenced by the similarities in general economic development level (the highest figures of similarity in the matrix can be observed between Japan and the Republic of Korea, Japan and Hong Kong, thus among the relatively most developed countries/areas) but this is also influenced by other factors, such as climate, geographical distance, and religion, since relatively low similarity indices can be found also between countries which are not very distant in general economic development level (such as between the Philippines and Pakistan);

(b) The country which is most similar to the rest of the region in respect of the GDP quantity structure is Thailand, with a 50.3 per cent average similarity index. The countries/areas which are the most distant from the quantity structure of the rest of the region are Hong Kong (with a 38.5 per cent average similarity index) and Pakistan (with a 40.5 per cent average similarity index). Nevertheless, the differences between the maximal and minimal values are relatively small (except for a few extreme cases, such as Japan - Republic of Korea 61.0 per cent, and Hong Kong - Bangladesh 25.3 per cent). Thus, one may conclude that the region is relatively evenly heterogeneous in respect of the quantity structure.

125. The main conclusions which can be drawn from table 15 are the following:

(a) The general picture on consumption structure differences is very similar to the picture given in table 14, both in respect of the averages and of the dispersion around the averages. The maximum indices in table 15 are somewhat lower than in table B (Republic of Korea - Thailand 58 per cent and the Philippines - India 57.6 per cent), and the minimum values are also somewhat lower than for the total of the GDP (Hong Kong - Nepal 20.9 per cent, Hong Kong - Bangladesh 22.6 per cent).

(b) General economic development level differences also influence the similarity indices, but perhaps to a somewhat lesser degree than was the case for the GDP matrix. Hong Kong's dissimilarity from the rest of the region is more accentuated for household consumption than it was for the GDP, with an average similarity index of 33.1 per cent. The country which is most similar to the rest of the region for consumption is the Republic of Korea (with an average similarity index of 46.8 per cent). Thailand occupies only the second place (with 45.1 per cent average similarity index).

(c) Nepal is the country with the lowest per capita consumption in the region. Its household consumption structure is relatively distant from the rest of the region (with an average similarity index of 39.4 per cent), although not as much distant as that of Hong Kong's structure.

126. The main conclusions which can be drawn from table 16are the following:

(a) Price similarities in the region are substantially higher than quantity similarities. While the overall average similarity index in the case of the GDP quantity structure remained below 45 per cent, the overall average similarity index in the case of the GDP price structure exceeds 70 per cent. All the country/area averages are within the 73.3 per cent and 66.9 per cent range, India being the country with the highest average price similarity index and Sri Lanka the country with the lowest. Even the extreme values are not very distant from each other; the Japan - Sri Lanka index is the lowest (56.8 per cent) and the Thailand - India price similarity is the highest (81.2 per cent).

(b) There is some influence of the general economic development level on the price similarities, although this influence seems to be relatively weak. A case which illustrates this weakness:

the price similarity index between Japan (the most developed country in the region) and India (the least developed country in the region) is higher (71.8 per cent) than the overall average price similarity index of the region (70.4 per cent).

127. The main conclusions which can be drawn from table 17 are the following:

(a) The overall picture does not differ much from that given in the preceding table. The overall average consumption price similarity index is somewhat above 70 per cent with relatively modest dispersion among countries/areas. Here again, Sri Lanka is the country with the most dissimilar price structure from the rest of the region (67.5 per cent); however, this index is only 6.4 per cent lower than the average price similarity index of the country most similar to the rest of the region (the Philippines, with 73.9 per cent). Even the distances between the extreme cases are somewhat smaller than in the preceding table: disregarding one exception, there are no similarity indices higher than 80 per cent and no indices lower than 60 per cent, (the only exception being the Bangladesh - Nepal consumption price similarity index, with 82.9 per cent).

(b) Nepal's price similarity indices do not differ significantly from the rest of the region in spite of the fact that Nepal is the country with lowest per capita consumption level.

V. EXTENSION OF THE RESULTS OF THE 1985 ESCAP COMPARISON

128. In this chapter the results of the 1985 ICP comparison for the ESCAP countries/areas are extended in three different dimensions. First, the per capita real GDP levels of the ESCAP countries/areas participating in ICP phase V are compared with those of the 22 OECD member countries. Second, among the 11 ESCAP countries/areas there are seven which also participated in the previous phase of ICP; therefore the relative levels of per capita GDP in the two benchmark years are contrasted. Third, because six years had elapsed since the reference year (1985) and because considerable changes occurred during that period, this chapter gives some information on development of per capita GDP and changes in prices between 1985-1990.

A. Comparison of ESCAP countries/areas with OECD member countries

129. The results of the ICP comparison for the different regions are presented in a world level publication of the PPPs and real GDP for all countries participating in phase V of ICP. However, since the world report will probably be published at a later point in time and may not become available to all readers of the present report, it was decided at the Asia-Pacific Seminar on the Use of Purchasing Power Parities, held at Niigata, Japan, from 26 to 30 November 1990, that at least the most important summary results of the participating ESCAP countries/areas should be compared with the 22 member countries of OECD in order to put the ESCAP countries/areas in a wider international scaling. Since Japan participated in both groups, and as the results of the OECD comparison were published a long time ago, the main indicators can easily be linked to any OECD country via Japan. This section shows the main differences between countries/areas belonging to these two different groups.

130. As is known from the previous comparisons carried out within ICP, the economic development level of the ESCAP region is much below the overall OECD level. The average per capita GDP level of the 10 ESCAP countries/areas ($2,255) is less than one fifth of the OECD average ($12,280) and somewhat above one fifth of the EEC average ($10,496). There are only two countries/areas in the ESCAP region, Japan and Hong Kong, the per capita GDP level of which is close to the OECD average. Japan's per capita GDP level was about the same in 1985 as those of Australia, Finland and France and was close to that of the Federal Republic of Germany and Denmark. The level of per capita GDP in Hong Kong was very close to those of New Zealand, Belgium, Italy, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Table 18. Total and per capita real GDP in OECD and ESCAP member countries/areas in United States dollars, 1985

	Total GDP (Billions of United States dollars)	*Population (Millions)*	*Per capita GDP*	
			(United States dollars)	*Percentage of United States GDP*
Belgium	105.2	9.9	10 673	64.7
Denmark	62.6	5.1	12 237	74.2
France	630.8	55.1	11 436	69.3
Germany, Fed.Rep.	742.6	61.0	12 170	73.8
Greece	58.5	10.0	5 883	35.7
Ireland	23.9	3.6	6 698	40.6
Italy	618.7	57.1	10 830	65.7
Luxembourg	4.9	0.4	13 418	81.4
Netherlands	163.1	14.5	11 258	68.3
Portugal	53.7	9.6	5 573	33.8
Spain	292.9	38.6	7 589	46.0
United Kingdom	617.4	56.6	10 905	66.1
EEC total	3 374.3	321.5	10 496	63.6
Austria	82.3	7.6	10 896	66.1
Finland	57.7	4.1	13 913	84.3
Norway	57.7	4.1	13 913	84.3
Sweden	105.9	8.3	12 679	76.9
Turkey	179.5	49.9	3 599	21.8
Australia	184.7	15.7	11 723	71.1
New Zealand	32.7	3.2	10 046	60.9
Japan	1 424.3	120.8	11 795[a]	71.5
Canada	387.2	25.4t	15 258	92.5
United States	3 946.6	239.3	16 494	100.0
OECD 10 (without EEC)	6 457.1	479.2	13 471	81.7
OECD total (22)	9 831.4	800.7	12 280	74.5
Japan	1 425.3	120.8	11 804[a]	71.6
Hong Kong	55.6	5.5	10 194	61.8
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	220.5	47.8	4 611	28.0
Korea	163.7	41.2	3 972	24.1
Thailand	135.2	51.3	2 636	16.0
Sri Lanka	29.3	15.8	1 849	11.2
Philippines	97.8	54.7	1 788	10.8
Pakistan	130.8	97.7	1 340	8.1
Bangladesh	81.8	98.6	829	5.0
India	564.9	755.0	748	4.5
ESCAP (10) total	2 904.9	1 288.4	2 255	13.7

Source: For OECD countries: OECD Department of Economics and Statistics, Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures, 1985.

[a] The minor difference between the two totals originates from the very small revision of national nominal expenditures.

and Austria. There are only two more countries in the ESCAP region which have a similar counterpart country among the OECD countries in respect of economic development: the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Republic of Korea, where the per capita GDP was between that of Portugal and Turkey. All other ESCAP countries are far below the lowest level of the OECD countries. Of course, in comparison with the most developed country, the United States of America, generally accepted as a basis for reference, the distance is much greater. The per capita level of the United States in 1985 was roughly 20 times higher than those of Bangladesh and India. [1]

131. As pointed out above, the selection of the United States dollar as a numeraire for the ESCAP region at the global level of GDP makes it possible directly to link the per capita Asian dollar values with the OECD dollar without any revaluation or adjustment. However, this is not valid for the individual components of GDP, which are valued differently in the various regions. Even within OECD two different sets of international prices were used: the average prices of the 12 EEC members for the comparison of the Community countries and OECD average prices for the other 10 OECD countries and for the total of the Community. The Asian price structure deviates from both these sets of prices. Since Japan took part in both the OECD and ESCAP comparisons, the components of Japan's GDP are available both in OECD and in ESCAP average prices. Table 19 below shows the differences between them. The most striking differences between the two price structures are the very low relative prices of government final consumption and medical care in the Asian countries and areas, which is counterbalanced by the very high prices of all types of investment goods. In the case of government consumption and medical care, the relative low price levels reflect the low wages of government employees in most countries/areas of the ESCAP region. It is worth mentioning that the relative price level of the "food, beverage and tobacco" category is higher in Asia than in the OECD member countries.

Table 19. Per capita GDP of Japan according to Asian and OECD average price structure

	Per capita GDP of Japan in United States dollars		*Ratio between*
	According to Asian average price structure	*According to OECD average price structure*	*Asian and OECD price structure*
Household consumption	7 127	7 773	0.917
Food, beverage and tobacco	1 469	1 261	1.165
Clothing and footwear	461	444	1.038
Gross rents, fuel, power	1 297	1 572	0.825
House furnishing	386	377	1.024
Medical care	715	1 203	0.594
Transport, communication	620	610	1.016
Recreation, education	1 041	1 073	0.970
Miscellaneous goods and services	1 080	1 198	0.902
Government final consumption	357	667	0.535
Gross fixed capital formation	3 605	2 836	1.271
Construction	1 989	1 635	1.217
Producer durables	1 616	1 202	1.344
Change in stocks	92	78	1.179
Net foreign balance	623	441	1.413
Gross domestic product	11 804[a]	11 795[a]	1.001

[a] *The minor difference between the two totals originates from* the very small revision of national nominal expenditures.

[1] The presently available data also permit a comparison with three other European countries which joined the ICP via Austria. Using the volume index of per capita GDP between Austria and these countries, the level in United States dollars in 1985 was $5,065 in Hungary, $4,743 in Yugoslavia and $3,981 in Poland, which corresponds to 30.7, 28.7 and 24.1 per cent of the United States level.

132. The above ratios not only give important information on the price structure, but also represent conversion factors which should be used for linking per capita levels of the individual components of GDP between any OECD and ESCAP countries/areas. In the case of the EEC countries, for the comparison of a given item, such as house furnishing, a double conversion is needed.

133. It is extremely important to note that not only in the ESCAP countries/areas, but with the exception of Norway, in all OECD member countries the comparative dollar price levels were also considerably below the price level of the United States. In other words, the percentage ratio of PPPs to exchange rates, expressed in both cases in national currency units per United States dollar, was below 100 practically everywhere in 1985. Out of the 21 countries compared with the United States, this ratio was below 60 per cent in four countries (Greece, Portugal, Spain and Turkey), between 61 and 80 per cent in seven countries, (Belgium, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom and New Zealand) and above 80 per cent in the remaining nine countries. Only in Norway was the PPP equal with the exchange rate. Nevertheless, the deviation of the exchange rates from the PPPs is considerable smaller in the OECD countries than in the ESCAP region in respect of the United States dollar. Furthermore, it should be taken into account, that the exchange rates of the national currencies greatly changed during the past five years and are continuing to fluctuate in the present period. It is beyond the scope of this report to show these changes for the OECD countries, together with the differences in the size of inflation. They will, however, be reviewed below for the ESCAP countries/areas.

B. Comparison of relative per capita GDP level between 1980 and 1985 for seven countries and areas

134. Seven out of the 11 ESCAP countries and areas participated not only in phase V, but also in phase IV of the ICP, so it seems natural to wish to compare the results obtained for these countries/areas in 1980 and 1985. Some of them (Japan, India, the Philippines and the Republic of Korea) also participated in earlier phases of the ICP; however, it seems unnecessary to extend the comparison so far back. Even in respect of the comparison of these two benchmark years, many theoretical and practical obstacles hinder the understanding and the evaluation of the results obtained in the two phases of ICP and their relation to official data published for the growth rates over the period. Nevertheless, the availability of such data makes it unavoidable that researchers contrast the two sets of data. Therefore, it is advisable to draw the attention of the users to the most important reasons why the successive results of comparisons over space may be in considerable conflict with relevant data on economic development over time.

135. There are three main reasons why the changes in relative per capita GDP may deviate from the levels expected on the basis of growth rates of GDP and population:

(a) National prices are used for weighting, or national price indices are used for deflating, components of GDP for growth rates over time, while international average prices are used for comparison of GDP levels over different countries. Very often different representative goods and prices are used for the two different purposes.

(b) The methods used in the successive phases of the ICP, especially in respect of adjustments for differences in qualities of representative commodities, are different.

(c) There may be considerable differences in the accuracy of basic data provided by the countries/areas on global GDP and its breakdown, or on the collection and averaging of prices.

136. In spite of these factors, the relative levels of per capita GDP changed more or less to the same extent as the growth rates differed between these seven countries/areas during the five-year monitoring period. As table 20 below shows, in four countries/areas, namely Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka and the Philippines, the differences in growth rates reasonably explain the direction and size of changes in relative per capita GDP levels. In the case of Japan, Pakistan and India, where the growth of

per capita GDP was considerably faster than in the United States, and therefore an increase of relative levels could be expected, a downward change can be observed. If the United States is excluded from this type of juxtaposing, and Japan is taken as a basis, the disharmony between the relevant data is smaller.

Table 20. Relative per capita GDP and growth rates in selected ESCAP countries and areas

	Per capita						
	United States dollars		*United States=100*		*Japan=100*		
	1980	*1985*	*1980*	*1985*	*1980*	*1985*	*Volume index of 1985 per capita GDP in percentage of 1980*
Japan	8 414	11 804	73.5	71.6	100.0	100.0	117.1
Hong Kong	7 166	10 194	62.6	61.8	85.2	86.4	108.3
Rep. of Korea	2 583	3 972	22.6	24.1	30.7	33.6	133.4
Sri Lanka	1 226	1 849	10.7	11.2	14.6	15.7	119.3
Philippines	1 740	1 788	15.2	10.8	20.7	15.1	85.4
Pakistan	1 097	1 340	9.6	8.1	13.0	11.4	117.6
India	570	748	5.0	4.5	6.8	6.3	119.4
United States	11 447	16 494	100.0	100.0	136.0	139.7	110.2

Source: *National Accounts Statistics; Main Aggregates and Detailed Tables, 1987 (United Natios publication, Sales No. E.90.XVII.*x, Part I and E. 90. XVII.2, Part II).

137. In evaluating the figures in the table above, it should be taken into account that there is little proof that the 1985 relative levels are more reliable than those of 1980, if the official national volume indices are accepted as the most credible indicators among the conflicting data. Considering the nature and normal limits of error of the ICP type data, there is no reason to deny or to correct retrospectively the results of the earlier comparisons. However, some important conclusions may be drawn from the analyses of the conflicts for the future phases of the ICP, especially if the analyses are carried out not only for the global GDP but also for its main components.

C. Economic development and changes in prices between 1985 and 1990

138. In the period after 1985, the differences in the economic development level among the ESCAP countries/areas continued to increase. The economy of countries/areas with higher per capita GDP (Japan, Hong Kong, the Republic of Korea) grew faster than in countries with a lower level of per capita GDP (such as Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and India). In the Philippines the growth of the economy between 1985 and 1990 was close to the average growth of the region. That, however, did not compensate for the fall of the previous five-year period. In the period between 1980 and 1985, the decrease of per capita GDP of the Philippines originated mainly from the large (19 per cent) growth of population which was followed by a modest (4 per cent) growth in GDP. Owing to the long war, the Islamic Republic of Iran's economy suffered a considerable decline in production, coupled with a large increase in population. Therefore its per capita GDP level is now almost 20 per cent lower than it was in 1985. There was an exceptionally high rate of economic development in Thailand during the five years under examination which brought this country closer to the level of Japan and Hong Kong. It was a general tendency that in the less developed countries the relatively modest growth rates of GDP were accompanied by a rather high increase in population. Table 21 below shows the growth of global and per capita GDP for the ESCAP countries/ areas which participated in phase V of the ICP starting in 1985. For putting the economic development of these countries/areas into a wider international frame, two memorandum items in the table show the growth of GDP for the total of OECD and the European Economic Community.

Table 21. Growth of GDP, population and per capita real GDP between 1985 and 1990 in 10 ESCAP countries and areas

1985 = 100

	Total GDP			*Population*			*Per capita GDP*		
	1988	*1989*	*1990*	*1988*	*1989*	*1990*	*1988*	*1989*	*1990*
Japan	113.3	118.9	124.0	101.5	101.7	101.8	111.6	116.9	121.8
Hong Kong	136.6	140.0	142.5	104.0	105.5	105.7	131.3	132.7	134.8
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	91.0	92.9	96.2	110.9	114.8	118.8	82.1	80.9	81.0
Rep. of Korea	140.4	148.9	161.6	103.7	104.9	106.8	135.4	141.9	152.2
Thailand	129.3	143.5	156.4	104.8	106.6	108.4	123.4	134.6	144.3
Sri Lanka	108.7	111.2	116.9	104.7	106.1	107.3	103.8	104.8	108.9
Philippines	113.4	119.7	124.8	107.4	110.1	112.9	105.6	108.7	110.5
Pakistan	120.2	127.0	133.4	109.6	113.0	116.5	109.7	112.4	114.5
Bangladesh	111.6	114.3	120.0	105.9	106.7	108.5	105.4	107.1	110.6
India	118.1	123.2	129.1	106.1	108.2	110.3	111.3	113.9	117.0
Memo items:									
OECD TOTAL	111.1	114.7	117.7[a]	102.1	102.8	–	108.8	111.6	–
European Economic Community									
TOTAL	109.8	113.8	117.0[a]	100.8	101.3		108.9	112.3	

Source for ESCAP countries: *The Economist*. International Economic Appraisal Service, Quarterly Bulletin, Quarter IV 1990, London. (The data published in this Bulletin deviate to a small extent from the corresponding data published for 1988 and/or 1989 in the International Monetary Fund's *International Financial Statistics*, February 1991. The trends shown in the two sources are, however, the same.)

Source for OECD countries: OECD Department Of Economics And Statistics: *Main Economic Indicators*, Paris, March 1991.

a 1990. Third quarter, seasonally adjusted.

139. Much greater changes have taken place in the official exchanges rates of the participating ESCAP countries/areas since 1985 than in economic development and in the rate of inflation. In six countries, all of them belonging to the less developed part of the region, the local rate of the United States dollar increased considerably during the last four to five years, to the greatest extent in Nepal, the Philippines and Sri Lanka. In most of these six countries the increase of the exchange rates exceeded the extent to which their consumer price index grew faster than that of the United States. However, in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh the exchange rate did not follow the tempo of the consumer price indices. In the other four countries, the local rate of the United States dollar in 1989 and at the end of 1990 was considerably below the rate of 1985, although in three of them the consumer prices grew much faster than in the United States. Especially great conflict can be observed in the Islamic Republic of Iran, where the consumer price index was 261 per cent in June 1990 (1985=100), greatly exceeding the United States consumer price index (116.75 per cent), while the exchange rate fell from 91 to 70 Iranian rials per dollar during the same period. The exchange rate of the United States dollar in Japan in November 1990 was practically half of the yearly average of 1985 while the consumer price index for the same period was only 8 percentage points below that of the United States.

Table 22. Changes in exchange rates and consumer price indices in ESCAP countries and areas between 1985 and 1990

	Exchange rates: national currency unit per United States dollar				*Consumer price index: 1985 = 100*		
	1985 average[a]	*1989 average*	*1990 in month indicated*		*1989 average*	*1980 in month indicated*	
Japan	238.5	137.96	N	129.08	103.7	N	108.9
Hong Kong							
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	91.05	72.015	Jun	70.255	239.7	Jun	261.0
Rep. of Korea	870.02	671.46	D	715.75	119.9	D	133.8
Thailand	27.16	25.702	O	25.105	114.2	O	129.4[b]
Sri Lanka	27.16	36.047	N	40.336	147.9	N	191.5
Philippines	18.61	21.737	D	28.000	125.8	D	153.9
Pakistan	15.93	20.541	N	21.856	127.2	N	147.4
Bangladesh	28.00	32.27	S	35.665	146.3	s	159.9
India	12.37	16.226	Jul	17.416	137.4	Jul	151.9
Nepal	18.25	27.189	O	30.260	156.3	O	177.2
United States	1.000	1.000		1.000	115.2	D	116.7

Source: International Monetary Fund, International Financial Statistics, February 1991.

a The exchange rates for 1985 in this table are slightly different in some countries/areas from those shown in table 8, which were reported by the individual countries and areas to the United National Statistical Office for ICP purposes. However, in the case of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the difference is more than three Iranian rials per dollar (88 vs 91), and in Bangladesh three taka (31 vs 28) per dollar.

b Wholesale price index.

140. Not only in the ESCAP region but also in the other parts of the world the exchange rates fluctuated to a great extent during the last five years and in several cases almost independently from the differences in the price indices of the countries concerned. In general, it can be stated that in most OECD member countries, where the consumer prices grew much faster than in the United States, the local rates of the United States dollar were much lower in 1989 and at the end of 1990 than they were in 1985. In some cases, such as Germany, France, Italy and Spain, the amount of local currency paid for one United States dollar fell by nearly one half during this period. In the case of Portugal where the consumer price index was 177 per cent in October 1990 (1985 = 100), the exchange rate of United States dollar decreased from 170 to 132 Portuguese escudos during the same period. There are, however, also some opposite direction of change, as in the United Kingdom, where the exchange rate of the pound sterling increased from 1.296 to 1.945 United States dollars between 1985 and October 1990, an increase which was much higher than the difference in the consumer price indices (116.7 versus 137.8).

Table A.1 Gross domestic product by expenditure categories in national currencies (millions), 1985.

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangadesh	India
	yen	Hong Kong dollars	Iranian rials	won	baht	Sri Lanka rupees	Philippines pesos	Pakistan rupees	taka	Indian rupees
Consumption	199 426 787	173 009	10 121 300	46 279 888	716 199	122 279	469 140	376 531	414 217	1 808 331
Food, bev. and tob.	40 805 552	25 592	4 033 900	19 641 024	274 614	64 519	261 681	160 289	261 376	1 007 713
Food	32 804 240	20 832	3 788 400	16 351 388	211 018	52 732	239 632	138 362	244 367	933 159
Bread,cer.	6 783 928	2 399	856 100	6 338 758	49 672	19 225	93 264	43 743	142 722	307 970
Meat	4 217 501	6 339	1 155 300	2 556 278	33 864	1 114	34 480	12 712	16 742	31 788
Fish	6 957 077	3 715	61 500	1 436 279	43 816	5 601	39 876	7 501	20 197	20 201
Milk,cheese	2 030 867	1 072	434 800	1 003 199	12 851	2 783	17 846	21 174	11 296	143 151
Oils, fats	393 974	881	115 100	232 576	5 616	764	5 067	15 003	12 926	112 448
Fruits,vegetabl.	5 714 583	3 943	939 800	3 228 306	36 431	14 382	26 553	16 959	22 574	176 977
Other food	6 706 514	2 483	225 800	1 555 992	28 768	8 863	22 546	21 270	17 910	140 624
Beverages	5 122 503	2 997	16 800	1 767 545	46 046	4 145	10 180	7 036	568	26 681
Non-alc.	1 409 406	1 302	16 800	490 733	15 757	96	4 739	7 036	134	1 554
Alcoholic	3 713 097	1 695	0	1 276 812	30 289	4 049	5 441	0	434	25 127
Tobacco	2 878 858	1 763	228 700	1 522 121	17 550	7 642	11 869	14 891	16 441	47 873
Clothing,footw.	11 637 784	16 246	887 600	2 927 270	112 304	8 078	18 301	23 721	30 834	199 013
Clothing	10 438 729	14 285	704 700	2 356 047	109 534	6 412	14 360	20 315	27 778	182 967
Footwear	1 199 055	1 961	182 900	571 223	2 770	1 666	3 941	3 406	3 056	16 046
Gross rents,fuel & power	34 675 584	25 497	2 334 700	4 867 334	50 684	6 743	90 046	61 301	72 266	188 128
Gross rents	28 790 176	22 292	2 097 900	2 740 023	27 779	3 208	65 275	42 964	45 298	126 256
Fuel and power	5 885 435	3 205	236 800	2 127 311	22 905	3 535	24 771	18 337	26 968	61 872
House furnishings	10 005 752	10 108	577 500	2 052 713	40 382	5 332	19 376	16 177	13 202	55 149
Furniture	916 512	2 037	113 800	239 137	9 152	770	1 408	1 995	3 775	6 339
Household textiles	1 417 405	221	123 200	363 742	1 498	92	798	2 697	2 147	0
Appliances	2 740 719	2 374	156 000	448 476	2 586	569	5 630	8 279	1 293	12 333
Other househ.goods	4 931 116	5 476	184 500	1 001 358	27 146	3 901	11 540	3 206	5 987	36 477
Medical care	20 070 816	10 462	570 000	2 166 739	38 442	2 613	10 603	3 606	8 093	53 980
Pharmac.prod	1 214 086	2 328	147 800	919 146	27 200	1 463	6 474	1 158	273	35 390
Health serv.	18 856 736	8 134	422 200	1 247 593	11 242	1 150	4 129	2 448	7 820	18 590
Transport,comm.	17 165 296	15 023	601 800	4 212 330	93 615	18 807	18 513	49 359	13 136	134 087
Transport equipm.	2 821 850	942	115 200	122 415	4 687	1 168	10 274	23 905	405	3 782
Operation costs	5 837 747	2 888	218 000	360 500	21 990	1 481	4 738	14 728	1 587	35 311
Purchased transp.	6 752 414	10 172	226 000	3 185 947	64 224	15 634	2 112	10 032	11 095	87 848
ser. Communication	1 753 298	1 021	42 600	543 468	2 714	524	1 389	694	49	7 146
Recreation,education	30 547 280	33 051	594 700	6 297 677	60 380	8 012	19 563	38 130	8 666	104 271
Equipm.for recr.	5 183 541	13 857	74 600	981 876	10 343	1 222	516	7 944	812	8 799
Recr. serv.	8 300 324	8 139	12 500	962 515	8 387	2 155	1 501	25 728	2 832	18 637
Books,newspapers	1 781 560	1 998	1 700	213 345	5 875	1 263	1 220	1 017	173	3 664
Education	15 281 894	9 057	495 900	4 139 941	35 775	3 372	16 326	3 441	4 849	73 171
Misc.goods,serv.	33 958 768	41 307	521 100	4 351 941	69 924	3 848	31 057	23 948	7 705	75 050
Restaurants,etc.	14 042 721	21 934	194 200	1 335 943	44 395	1 118	17 311	4 757	241	17 592
Net exp.of res.abroad	899 560	-4 277	0	-236 485	-24 146	4 327	0	0	-1 061	-9 060
Government	16 158 471	16 762	1 753 500	6 022 230	142 083	14 356	44 044	66 770	39 151	219 010
Capital formation	100 939 032	70 981	3 401 100	23 046 784	238 240	18 461	103 467	49 686	44 226	613 832
Domestic capital form.	90 163 248	56 415	3 221 100	22 642 720	244 384	37 877	85 402	89 893	87 684	681 772
Gross fixed cap.form.	87 515 056	54 953	2 537 300	22 434 128	232 052	37 652	89 974	80 893	84 052	545 488
Construction	54 107 408	31 619	1 805 600	13 763 843	126 874	21 858	56 228	43 877	51 606	273 259
Residential build.	15 446 052	16 238	1 212 500	3 494 122	39 052	9 525	15 164	8 205	28 520	74 492
Non-res.build.	15 184 550	9 624	287 000	4 138 138	32 111	3 039	22 368	15 254	7 373	53 419
Other construction	19 242 928	4 731	306 100	5 146 770	53 914	6 490	13 383	15 469	13 466	145 348
Land improvement	4 233 912	1 026	0	984 813	1 797	2 804	5 313	4 949	2 247	0
Producer durables	33 407 744	23 334	731 700	8 670 408	105 178	15 794	33 746	37 016	32 446	272 229
Transport equipm.	7 049 204	3 308	314 600	2 382 062	20 419	5 329	3 427	8 411	6 198	62 496
Machinery and equipm.	14 949 537	11 051	216 400	3 319 994	47 886	4 973	12 526	26 507	14 291	94 166
Electrical mach.	8 626 428	7 398	101 300	2 256 273	15 412	5 309	11 356	1 781	9 302	77 441
Other prod.dur.	2 782 669	1 577	99 400	712 079	21 461	183	6 437	317	2 655	38 126
Change in stocks	2 648 192	1 462	683 800	208 598	12 332	225	-4 572	9 000	3 632	136 284
Net foreign balance	10 775 560	14 566	180 000	404 079	-6 144	-19 416	18 065	-40 207	-43 458	-67 940
GDP	316 524 292	260 752	15 275 900	75 348 768	1 096 522	155 096	616 651	492 987	497 594	2 641 173

Table A.2 Per capiata gross domestic product by expenditure categories in national currencies, 1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
	yen	Hong Kong dollars	Iranian rials	won	baht	Sri Lanka rupees	Philippines pesos	Pakistan rupees	Bangladesh taka	Indian rupees
Consumption	1 651 513	31 709	211 652	1 123 034	13 961	7 721	8 581	3 854	4 198	2 395
Food, bev. and tob.	337 923	4 690	84 356	476 608	5 353	4 074	4 787	1 641	2 649	1 335
Food	271 662	3 818	79 222	396 781	4 113	3 330	4 383	1 417	2 477	1 236
Bread,cer.	56 180	440	17 903	153 816	968	1 214	1 706	448	1 447	408
Meat	34 926	1 162	24 159	62 031	660	70	631	130	170	42
Fish	57 614	681	1 286	34 853	854	354	729	77	205	27
Milk,cheese	16 818	196	9 092	24 344	251	176	326	217	114	190
Oils, fats	3 263	161	2 407	5 644	109	48	93	154	131	149
Fruits,vegetabl.	47 324	723	19 653	78 338	710	908	486	174	229	234
Other food	555 389	455	4 722	37 758	561	560	412	218	182	186
Beverages	42 421	549	351	42 891	898	262	186	72	6	35
Non-alc.	11 672	239	351	11 908	307	6	87	72	1	2
Alcoholic	30 749	311	0	30 983	590	256	100	0	4	33
Tobacco	23 841	323	4 783	36 936	342	483	217	152	167	63
Clothing,footw.	96 376	2 978	18 561	71 033	2 189	510	335	243	313	264
Clothing	86 446	2 618	14 737	57 172	2 135	405	263	208	282	242
Footwear	9 930	359	3 825	13 861	54	105	72	35	31	21
Gross rents,fuel & power	287 159	4 673	48 823	118 110	988	426	1 647	628	732	249
Gross rents	238 420	4 086	43 871	66 489	542	203	1 194	440	459	167
Fuel and power	48 739	587	4 952	51 621	446	223	453	188	273	82
House furnishings	82 861	1 853	12 077	49 811	787	337	354	166	134	73
Furniture	7 590	373	2 380	5 803	178	49	26	20	38	8
Household textiles	11 738	41	2 576	8 827	29	6	15	28	22	0
Appliances	22 697	435	3 262	10 883	50	36	103	85	13	16
Other househ.goods	40 836	1 004	3 858	24 299	529	246	211	33	61	48
Medical care	166 212	1 917	11 920	52 578	749	165	194	37	82	71
Pharmac.prod	10 054	427	3 091	22 304	530	92	118	12	3	47
Health serv.	156 158	1 491	8 829	30 274	219	73	76	25	79	25
Transport,comm.	142 151	2 753	12 585	102 216	1 825	1 188	339	505	133	178
Transport equipm.	23 369	173	2 409	2 971	91	74	188	245	4	5
Operation costs	48 344	529	4 559	8 748	429	94	87	151	16	47
Purchased transp.serv.	55 919	1 864	4 726	77 310	1 252	987	39	103	112	116
Communication	14 520	187	891	13 188	53	33	25	7	0	9
Recreation,education	252 971	6 058	12 436	152 819	1 177	506	358	390	88	138
Equipm.for recr.	42 926	2 540	1 560	23 826	202	77	9	81	8	12
Recr. serv.	68 737	1 492	261	23 356	163	136	27	263	29	25
Books,newspapers	14 754	366	245	5 177	115	80	22	10	2	5
Education	126 554	1 660	10 370	100 460	697	213	299	35	49	97
Misc.goods,serv.	281 223	7 571	10 897	105 604	1 363	243	568	245	78	99
Restaurants,etc	116 292	4 020	4 061	32 418	865	71	317	49	2	23
Net exp.of res.abroad	7 450	(784)	0	-5 739	(471)	273	0	0	(11)	(12)
Government	133 813	3 072	36 669	146 135	2 770	906	806	684	397	290
Capital formation	835 906	13 009	71 123	559 254	4 644	1 166	1 893	509	448	813
Domestic capital form.	746 669	10 340	67 359	549 449	4 764	2 392	1 562	920	889	903
Gross fixed cap.form.	724 738	10 072	53 060	544 387	4 523	2 377	1 646	828	852	722
Construction	448 080	5 795	37 758	333 992	2 473	1 380	1 029	449	523	362
Residential build.	127 913	2 976	25 356	84 788	761	601	277	84	289	99
Non-res.build.	125 748	1 764	6 002	100 416	626	192	409	156	75	71
Other construction	159 356	867	6 401	124 891	1 051	410	245	158	136	193
Land improvement	35 062	188	0	23 897	35	177	97	51	23	0
Producer durables	276 660	4 277	15 301	210 395	2 050	997	617	379	329	361
Transport equipm.	58 377	606	6 579	57 803	398	336	63	86	63	83
Machinery and equipm.	123 802	2 025	4 525	80 563	933	314	229	271	145	125
Electrical mach.	71 438	1 356	2 118	54 751	300	335	208	18	94	103
Other prod.dur.	23 044	289	2 079	17 279	418	12	118	3	27	50
Change in stocks	21 930	268	14 300	5 062	240	14	(84)	92	37	181
Net foreign balance	89 236	2 670	3 764	9 805	(120)	(-1 226)	330	(412)	(440)	(90)
GDP	2 621 232	47 790	319 444	1 828 407	21 374	9 793	11 280	5 047	5 043	3 498

Table A.3 Percentage distribution of gross domestic product in national currencies, 1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
	yen	Hong Kong dollars	Iranian rials	won	baht	Sri Lanka rupees	Philippines pesos	Pakistan rupees	taka	Indian rupees
Consumption	63.0%	66.4%	66.3%	61.4%	65.3%	78.8%	76.1%	76.4%	83.2%	68.5%
Food, bev. and tob.	12.9%	9.8%	26.4%	26.1%	25.0%	41.6%	42.4%	32.5%	52.5%	38.2%
Food	10.4%	8.0%	24.8%	21.7%	19.2%	34.0%	38.9%	28.1%	49.1%	35.3%
Bread,cer.	2.1%	0.9%	5.6%	8.4%	4.5%	12.4%	15.1%	8.9%	28.7%	11.7%
Meat	1.3%	2.4%	7.6%	3.4%	3.1%	0.7%	5.6%	2.6%	3.4%	1.2%
Fish	2.2%	1.4%	0.4%	1.9%	4.0%	3.6%	6.5%	1.5%	4.1%	0.8%
Milk,cheese	0.6%	0.4%	2.8%	1.3%	1.2%	1.8%	2.9%	4.3%	2.3%	5.4%
Oils, fats	0.1%	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.8%	3.1%	2.6%	4.3%
Fruits,vegetabl.	1.8%	1.5%	6.2%	4.3%	3.3%	9.3%	4.3%	3.4%	4.5%	6.7%
Other food	2.1%	1.0%	1.5%	2.1%	2.6%	5.7%	3.7%	4.3%	3.6%	5.3%
Beverages	1.6%	1.1%	0.1%	2.3%	4.2%	2.7%	1.6%	1.4%	0.1%	1.0%
Non-alc.	0.4%	0.5%	0.1%	0.7%	1.4%	0.1%	0.8%	1.4%	0.0%	0.1%
Alcoholic	1.2%	0.7%	0.0%	1.7%	2.8%	2.6%	0.9%	0.0%	0.1%	0.9%
Tobacco	0.9%	0.7%	1.5%	2.0%	1.6%	4.9%	1.9%	3.0%	3.3%	1.8%
Clothing,footw.	3.7%	6.2%	5.8%	3.9%	10.2%	5.2%	3.0%	4.8%	6.2%	7.5%
Clothing	3.3%	5.5%	4.6%	3.1%	10.0%	4.1%	2.3%	4.1%	5.6%	6.9%
Footwear	0.4%	0.8%	1.2%	0.8%	0.3%	1.1%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%
Gross rents,fuel & power	11.0%	9.8%	15.3%	6.5%	4.6%	4.4%	14.6%	12.4%	14.5%	7.1%
Gross rents	9.1%	8.5%	13.7%	3.6%	2.5%	2.1%	10.6%	8.7%	9.1%	4.8%
Fuel and power	1.9%	1.2%	1.6%	2.8%	2.1%	2.3%	4.0%	3.7%	5.4%	2.3%
House furnishings	3.2%	3.9%	3.8%	2.7%	3.7%	3.4%	3.1%	3.3%	2.7%	2.1%
Furniture	0.3%	0.8%	0.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%
Household textiles	0.4%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%
Appliances	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%	0.9%	1.7%	0.3%	0.5%
Other househ.goods	1.6%	2.1%	1.2%	1.3%	2.5%	2.5%	1.9%	0.7%	1.2%	1.4%
Medical care	6.3%	4.0%	3.7%	2.9%	3.5%	1.7%	1.7%	0.7%	1.6%	2.0%
Pharmac.prod	0.4%	0.9%	1.0%	1.2%	2.5%	0.9%	1.0%	0.2%	0.1%	1.3%
Health serv.	6.0%	3.1%	2.8%	1.7%	1.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	1.6%	0.7%
Transport,comm.	5.4%	5.8%	3.9%	5.6%	8.5%	12.1%	3.0%	10.0%	2.6%	5.1%
Transport equipm.	0.9%	0.4%	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	0.8%	1.7%	4.9%	0.1%	0.1%
Operation costs	1.8%	1.1%	1.4%	0.5%	2.0%	1.0%	0.8%	3.0%	0.3%	1.3%
Purchased transp.serv.	2.1%	3.9%	1.5%	4.2%	5.9%	10.1%	0.3%	2.0%	2.2%	3.3%
Communication	0.6%	0.4%	0.3%	0.7%	0.2%	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.3%
Recreation,education	9.7%	12.7%	3.9%	8.4%	5.5%	5.2%	3.2%	7.7%	1.7%	3.9%
Equipm.for recr.	1.6%	5.3%	0.5%	1.3%	0.9%	0.8%	0.1%	1.6%	0.2%	0.3%
Recr. serv.	2.6%	3.1%	0.1%	1.3%	0.8%	1.4%	0.2%	5.2%	0.6%	0.7%
Books,newspapers	0.6%	0.8%	0.1%	0.3%	0.5%	0.8%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.1%
Education	4.8%	3.5%	3.2%	5.5%	3.3%	2.2%	2.7%	0.7%	1.0%	2.8%
Misc.goods,serv.	10.7%	15.8%	3.4%	5.8%	6.4%	2.5%	5.0%	4.9%	1.5%	2.8%
Restaurants,etc	4.4%	8.4%	1.3%	1.8%	4.0%	0.7%	2.8%	1.0%	0.0%	0.7%
Net exp.of res.abroad	0.3%	-1.6%	0.0%	-0.3%	-2.2%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	-0.2%	-0.3%
Government	5.1%	6.4%	11.5%	8.0%	13.0%	9.3%	7.1%	13.6%	7.9%	8.3%
Capital formation	31.9%	27.2%	22.3%	30.6%	21.7%	11.9%	16.8%	10.1%	8.9%	23.2%
Domestic capital form.	28.5%	21.6%	21.1%	30.1%	22.3%	24.4%	13.8%	18.2%	17.6%	25.8%
Gross fixed cap.form.	27.6%	21.1%	16.6%	29.8%	21.2%	24.3%	14.6%	16.4%	16.9%	20.6%
Construction	17.1%	12.1%	11.8%	18.3%	11.6%	14.1%	9.1%	8.9%	10.4%	10.3%
Residential build.	4.9%	6.2%	7.9%	4.6%	3.6%	6.1%	2.5%	1.7%	5.7%	2.8%
Non-res.build.	4.8%	3.7%	1.9%	5.5%	2.9%	2.0%	3.6%	3.1%	1.5%	2.0%
Other construction	6.1%	1.8%	2.0%	6.8%	4.9%	4.2%	2.2%	3.1%	2.7%	5.5%
Land improvement	1.3%	0.4%	0.0%	1.3%	0.2%	1.8%	0.9%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%
Producer durables	10.6%	8.9%	4.8%	11.5%	9.6%	10.2%	5.5%	7.5%	6.5%	10.3%
Transport equipm.	2.2%	1.3%	2.1%	3.2%	1.9%	3.4%	0.6%	1.7%	1.2%	2.4%
Machinery and equipm.	4.7%	4.2%	1.4%	4.4%	4.4%	3.2%	2.0%	5.4%	2.9%	3.6%
Electrical mach.	2.7%	2.8%	0.7%	3.0%	1.4%	3.4%	1.8%	0.4%	1.9%	2.9%
Other prod.dur.	0.9%	0.6%	0.7%	0.9%	2.0%	0.1%	1.0%	0.1%	0.5%	1.4%
Change in stocks	0.8%	0.6%	4.5%	0.3%	1.1%	0.1%	-0.7%	1.8%	0.7%	5.2%
Net foreign balance	3.4%	5.6%	1.2%	0.5%	-0.6%	-12.5%	2.9%	-8.2%	-8.7%	-2.6%
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GDP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A.4 Per capita gross domestic product by expenditure categories in Asian dollars, 1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thai-land	Sri Lanka	Philip-pines	Pakistan	Bangla-desh	India	Average
Consumption	7 127	7 075	3 154	2 406	1 766	1 115	1 401	949	649	540	1 473
Food, bev. and tob.	1 469	1 270	1 189	967	721	525	829	415	379	293	521
Food	1 108	1 040	1 153	768	622	467	757	366	354	276	455
Bread,cer.	215	139	282	325	209	188	323	114	208	84	140
Meat	133	345	295	111	90	17	102	46	34	13	50
Fish	200	163	10	56	132	65	158	33	28	10	45
Milk,cheese	83	57	131	38	24	20	41	44	12	44	47
Oils, fats	27	53	58	12	13	6	15	40	13	29	28
Fruits,vegetabl.	172	174	273	158	112	110	57	44	38	58	80
Other food	277	108	104	68	42	61	61	45	19	39	65
Beverages	214	148	6	108	73	22	33	16	0	5	33
Non-alc.	55	61	6	28	32	1	14	16	0	0	10
Alcoholic	159	87	0	79	40	21	19	0	0	5	0
Tobacco	147	81	31	91	27	36	39	34	25	11	32
Clothing,footw.	461	733	291	178	188	100	60	84	50	49	113
Clothing	411	633	235	147	182	84	43	77	45	46	101
Footwear	50	99	56	31	6	15	17	6	4	3	12
Gross rents,fuel & power	1 297	516	671	200	122	45	157	111	109	72	226
Gross rents	1 115	411	476	115	67	15	89	53	68	56	176
Fuel and power	182	105	195	85	54	30	68	58	41	16	50
House furnishings	386	477	145	136	97	55	56	31	18	14	67
Furniture	26	105	33	13	33	14	4	5	6	2	8
Household textiles	49	10	30	41	3	1	1	7	2	0	0
Appliances	124	131	34	23	4	3	11	13	3	2	17
Other househ.goods	187	230	48	59	56	37	40	6	7	10	33
Medical care	715	324	182	92	99	43	24	24	10	17	96
Pharmac.prod	42	66	57	19	75	15	10	3	1	11	18
Health serv.	673	258	125	73	24	27	14	21	9	6	79
Transport,comm.	620	602	279	217	219	159	24	111	39	37	123
Transport equipm.	166	26	5	5	6	4	9	18	0	1	19
Operation costs	223	74	95	20	41	14	9	48	4	7	35
Purchased transp.serv.	166	454	163	155	169	134	3	44	34	28	59
Communication	65	48	15	36	4	8	3	1	0	1	0
Recreation,education	1 041	1 288	137	304	187	128	117	72	28	39	162
Equipm.for recr.	219	535	8	54	17	4	1	8	0	1	27
Recr. serv.	304	448	5	48	15	42	9	44	7	7	41
Books,newspapers	70	61	3	9	11	6	3	1	0	1	9
Education	447	244	121	193	145	76	104	19	20	31	86
Misc.goods,serv.	1 080	2 029	259	326	202	45	134	99	20	21	165
Restaurants,etc	500	739	94	84	95	10	55	22	1	4	66
Net exp.of res.abroad	59	-167	0	-14	-69	17	0	0	-2	-3	0
Government	357	330	348	250	446	259	228	303	135	75	163
Capital formation	4 320	2 792	1 110	1 316	425	475	160	90	45	134	618
Domestic capital form.	3 697	2 223	1 039	1 297	433	550	131	132	69	146	566
Gross fixed cap.form.	3 605	2 166	849	1 287	410	548	141	115	65	115	530
Construction	1 989	1 252	710	871	261	490	57	74	42	73	316
Residential build.	525	499	496	264	76	145	10	16	21	23	99
Non-res.build.	553	440	109	306	67	153	33	24	7	12	83
Other construction	749	258	106	253	113	135	10	26	12	38	115
Land improvement	162	55	0	48	4	57	4	8	2	0	0
Producer durables	1 616	913	139	416	149	58	84	41	23	43	214
Transport equipm.	400	93	33	78	14	13	2	4	1	9	48
Machinery and equipm.	677	421	58	181	47	23	25	34	16	18	90
Electrical mach.	418	306	22	115	11	21	41	3	5	10	54
Other prod.dur.	122	93	26	42	77	1	17	1	1	6	22
Change in stocks	92	57	190	10	23	2	-11	17	4	31	36
Net foreign balance	623	570	71	19	-7	-75	29	-43	-24	-12	52
GDP	11 804	10 194	4 611	3 972	2 636	1 849	1 788	1 340	829	748	2 255

Table A.5. Percentage distribution of gross domestic product in Asian dollars, 1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
Consumption	60.4%	69.4%	68.4%	60.6%	67.0%	60.3%	60.3%	70.8%	78.3%	72.1
Food, bev. and tob.	12.4%	12.5%	25.8%	24.3%	27.3%	28.4%	28.4%	31.0%	45.7%	39.2
Food	9.4%	10.2%	25.0%	19.3%	23.6%	25.3%	25.3%	27.3%	42.7%	36.9
Bread,cer.	1.8%	1.4%	6.1%	8.2%	7.9%	10.1%	10.1%	8.5%	25.1%	11.3
Meat	1.1%	3.4%	6.4%	2.8%	3.4%	0.9%	0.9%	3.4%	4.2%	1.7
Fish	1.7%	1.6%	0.2%	1.4%	5.0%	3.5%	3.5%	2.4%	3.4%	1.3
Milk,cheese	0.7%	0.6%	2.8%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	3.3%	1.5%	5.8
Oils, fats	0.2%	0.5%	1.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%	3.0%	1.6%	3.9
Fruits,vegetabl.	1.5%	1.7%	5.9%	4.0%	4.2%	6.0%	6.0%	3.3%	4.6%	7.7
Other food	2.4%	1.1%	2.3%	1.7%	1.6%	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	2.3%	5.2
Beverages	1.8%	1.5%	0.1%	2.7%	2.8%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	0.1%	0.7
Non-alc.	0.5%	0.6%	0.1%	0.7%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0
Alcoholic	1.4%	0.8%	0.0%	2.0%	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7
Tobacco	1.2%	0.8%	0.7%	2.3%	1.0%	1.9%	1.9%	2.5%	3.0%	1.5
Clothing,footw.	3.9%	7.2%	6.3%	4.5%	7.1%	5.4%	5.4%	6.2%	6.0%	6.6
Clothing	3.5%	6.2%	5.1%	3.7%	6.9%	4.6%	4.6%	5.7%	5.5%	6.1
Footwear	0.4%	1.0%	1.2%	0.8%	0.2%	0.8%	0.8%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5
Gross rents,fuel& power	11.0%	5.1%	14.6%	5.0%	4.6%	2.5%	2.5%	8.3%	13.1%	9.7
Gross rents	9.4%	4.0%	10.3%	2.9%	2.6%	0.8%	0.8%	3.9%	8.2%	7.5
Fuel and power	1.5%	1.0%	4.2%	2.1%	2.1%	1.6%	1.6%	4.4%	4.9%	2.2
House furnishings	3.3%	4.7%	3.1%	3.4%	3.7%	2.9%	2.9%	2.3%	2.1%	1.9
Furniture	0.2%	1.0%	0.7%	0.3%	1.2%	0.8%	0.8%	0.4%	0.7%	0.3
Household textiles	0.4%	0.1%	0.7%	1.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0
Appliances	1.0%	1.3%	0.7%	0.6%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.9%	0.4%	0.2
Other househ.goods	1.6%	2.3%	1.0%	1.5%	2.1%	2.0%	2.0%	0.5%	0.9%	1.3
Medical care	6.1%	3.2%	3.9%	2.3%	3.8%	2.3%	2.3%	1.8%	1.1%	2.3
Pharmac.prod	0.4%	0.7%	1.2%	0.5%	2.9%	0.8%	0.8%	0.2%	0.1%	1.5
Health serv.	5.7%	2.5%	2.7%	1.8%	0.9%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	1.1%	0.8
Transport,comm.	5.3%	5.9%	6.0%	5.5%	8.3%	8.6%	8.6%	8.3%	4.6%	4.9
Transport equipm.	1.4%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	1.3%	0.0%	0.1
Operation costs	1.9%	0.7%	2.1%	0.5%	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	3.6%	0.5%	0.9
Purchased transp.serv.	1.4%	4.5%	3.5%	3.9%	6.4%	7.2%	7.2%	3.3%	4.1%	3.7
Communication	0.6%	0.5%	0.3%	0.9%	0.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.1%	0.0%	0.2
Recreation,education	8.8%	12.6%	3.0%	7.7%	7.1%	6.9%	6.9%	5.4%	3.3%	5.2
Equipm.for recr.	1.9%	5.3%	0.2%	1.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.1%	0.1
Recr. serv.	2.6%	4.4%	0.1%	1.2%	0.6%	2.3%	2.3%	3.3%	0.9%	0.9
Books,newspapers	0.6%	0.6%	0.1%	0.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1
Education	3.8%	2.4%	2.6%	4.9%	5.5%	4.1%	4.1%	1.4%	2.4%	4.1
Misc.goods,serv.	9.2%	19.9%	5.6%	8.2%	7.6%	2.4%	2.4%	7.4%	2.4%	2.8
Restaurants,etc	4.2%	7.3%	2.0%	2.1%	3.6%	0.5%	0.5%	1.6%	0.1%	0.6
Net exp.of res.abroad	0.5%	-1.6%	0.0%	-0.4%	-2.6%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	-0.2%	-0.4
Government	3.0%	3.2%	7.5%	6.3%	16.9%	14.0%	14.0%	22.6%	16.2%	10.0
Capital formation	36.6%	27.4%	24.1%	33.1%	16.1%	25.7%	25.7%	6.7%	5.5%	17.9
Domestic capital form.	31.3%	21.8%	22.5%	32.7%	16.4%	29.8%	29.8%	9.9%	8.3%	19.5
Gross fixed cap.form.	30.5%	21.2%	18.4%	32.4%	15.5%	29.6%	29.6%	8.6%	7.8%	15.4
Construction	16.8%	12.3%	15.4%	21.9%	9.9%	26.5%	26.5%	5.5%	5.1%	9.7
Residential build.	4.4%	4.9%	10.8%	6.6%	2.9%	7.8%	7.8%	1.2%	2.5%	3.0
Non-res.build.	4.7%	4.3%	2.4%	7.7%	2.6%	8.3%	8.3%	1.8%	0.9%	1.6
Other construction	6.3%	2.5%	2.3%	6.4%	4.3%	7.3%	7.3%	1.9%	1.5%	5.1
Land improvement	1.4%	0.5%	0.0%	1.2%	0.1%	3.1%	3.1%	0.6%	0.2%	0.0
Producer durables	13.7%	9.0%	3.0%	10.5%	5.6%	3.1%	3.1%	3.1%	2.7%	5.7
Transport equipm.	3.4%	0.9%	0.7%	2.0%	0.5%	0.7%	0.7%	0.3%	0.1%	1.2
Machinery and equipm.	5.7%	4.1%	1.2%	4.6%	1.8%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	1.9%	2.4
Electrical mach.	3.5%	3.0%	0.5%	2.9%	0.4%	1.1%	1.1%	0.2%	0.6%	1.3
Other prod.dur.	1.0%	0.9%	0.6%	1.1%	2.9%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.8
Change in stocks	0.8%	0.6%	4.1%	0.2%	0.9%	0.1%	0.1%	1.3%	0.5%	4.1
Net foreign balance	5.3%	5.6%	1.5%	0.5%	-0.3%	-4.1%	-4.1%	-3.2%	-2.8%	-1.6
GDP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0

Table A.6 Purchasing Power Parities in Asian dollars, 1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
	yen	Hong Kong dollars	Iranian rials	won	baht	Sri Lanka rupees	Philippines pesos	Pakistan rupees	taka	Indian rupees
Consumption	231.7158	4.4816	67.1164	466.7726	7.9075	6.9245	6.1247	4.0617	6.4697	4.4385
Food, bev. and tob.	230.0591	3.6941	70.9277	492.9778	7.4247	7.7659	5.7750	3.9509	6.9878	4.5543
Food	245.1961	3.6706	68.7384	516.6048	6.6174	7.1331	5.7877	3.8731	7.0065	4.4713
Bread,cer.	261.5640	3.1549	63.5724	473.5700	4.6274	6.4697	5.2739	3.9134	6.9493	4.8323
Meat	262.8516	3.3659	81.8129	556.6862	7.3215	4.2168	6.1997	2.8127	4.9359	3.2684
Fish	287.4586	4.1722	134.1016	625.2230	6.4937	5.4656	4.6101	2.3599	7.2207	2.7358
Milk,cheese	202.3712	3.4597	69.3104	639.8492	10.2824	8.6229	7.9680	4.8796	9.4376	4.3569
Oils, fats	121.1207	3.0284	41.6472	463.4910	8.4087	8.2722	6.3104	3.8872	10.1521	5.0765
Fruits,vegetabl.	274.5962	4.1488	71.9309	497.3376	6.3582	8.2422	8.4696	3.9641	5.9583	4.0531
Other food	200.1584	4.1957	45.4912	552.3264	13.4847	9.1175	6.7665	4.8646	9.4611	4.8163
Beverages	198.0255	3.7128	59.8268	398.8451	12.3798	11.8889	5.6991	4.5721	13.3291	6.4758
Non-alc.	212.7309	3.8863	59.8268	421.2063	9.5164	7.4819	6.3071	4.5721	8.6791	5.4628
Alcoholic	192.9581	3.5909	0.0000	390.8757	14.6773	12.0572	5.2575	0.0000	15.9712	6.5508
Tobacco	162.5268	3.9706	154.5595	405.3144	12.7257	13.4884	5.5964	4.5022	6.6160	5.6653
Clothing,footw.	209.2371	4.0644	63.7693	398.2357	11.6424	5.1220	5.6184	2.9098	6.3127	5.3461
Clothing	210.3105	4.1347	62.7754	389.0943	11.7178	4.8112	6.1275	2.7007	6.2044	5.2875
Footwear	200.3173	3.6144	67.9087	441.1767	9.2717	6.8171	4.3129	5.4098	7.5020	6.1228
Gross rents,fuel & power	221.3963	9.0617	72.7184	589.7826	8.1236	9.3781	10.4643	5.6616	6.7435	3.4484
Gross rents	213.7463	9.9383	92.1263	576.0002	8.0332	13.1172	13.4130	8.3618	6.7656	2.9782
Fuel and power	268.3706	5.6114	25.3708	608.5342	8.2366	7.4509	6.6259	3.2229	6.7065	5.0873
House furnishings	214.7130	3.8816	83.2334	365.9362	8.1302	6.1791	6.3493	5.3733	7.5981	5.1698
Furniture	292.3939	3.5440	72.2403	456.9280	5.4408	3.3875	7.0304	4.2182	6.7360	3.8877
Household textiles	239.4984	3.9659	85.0195	212.9705	9.2876	7.0135	14.8315	3.9247	13.3703	0.0000
Appliances	183.3877	3.3190	95.4453	478.1172	11.2725	14.2015	9.4123	6.7009	4.1567	8.6449
Other househ.goods	218.1643	4.3597	80.9410	410.3773	9.3800	6.6976	5.2467	5.2125	8.4869	4.7929
Medical care	232.4690	5.9161	65.5366	574.1251	7.5709	3.8745	8.0988	1.5142	8.6182	4.0766
Pharmac.prod	239.2742	6.4365	54.6654	1184.3469	7.0459	5.9466	11.2908	3.8741	5.2743	4.1085
Health serv.	232.0432	5.7802	70.4401	416.1434	9.2370	2.6848	5.6114	1.1757	8.8132	4.0170
Transport,comm.	229.2216	4.5707	45.1631	471.3198	8.3154	7.4715	13.9343	4.5355	3.4536	4.8529
Transport equipm.	140.4606	6.6662	443.2675	547.9198	16.1465	20.7509	20.6961	13.6502	31.0024	6.0764
Operation costs	216.8437	7.1162	48.1117	429.8789	10.3640	6.8818	9.2103	3.1362	3.8145	7.2179
Purchased transp.serv.	337.1156	4.1019	28.9852	498.5564	7.4298	7.3647	12.8378	2.3327	3.2914	4.1919
Communication	223.5400	3.9050	57.8063	366.0299	13.4214	4.2655	9.0659	5.1773	0.0000	6.1678
Recreation,education	243.0301	4.7019	90.6543	502.5411	6.2827	3.9547	3.0556	5.3822	3.1737	3.5258
Equipm.for recr.	195.5902	4.7441	193.3377	439.8172	12.1665	19.6811	12.6301	10.0986	17.9602	11.3541
Recr. serv.	226.2430	3.3331	50.7088	489.0869	11.0747	3.2257	2.8873	6.0267	4.0320	3.7775
Books,newspapers	209.8994	5.9817	74.0029	562.8273	10.7901	13.8564	6.6024	7.9680	6.4622	4.6565
Education	282.9141	6.8021	85.9523	520.5895	4.7966	2.7991	2.8859	1.8095	2.4785	3.1704
Misc.goods,serv.	260.3377	3.7316	42.0878	323.8859	6.7595	5.4201	4.2378	2.4822	3.9167	4.7905
Restaurants,etc	232.7500	5.4379	43.3957	388.2036	9.0959	7.1101	5.8064	2.2671	3.3954	5.4506
Net exp.of res.abroad	126.9961	4.6879	0.0000	409.0178	6.7866	16.3424	0.0000	0.0000	6.4932	3.7822
Government	375.3405	9.3101	105.5149	584.0165	6.2175	3.5047	3.5403	2.2591	2.9496	3.8877
Capital formation	193.5003	4.6598	64.0740	425.0504	10.9190	2.4536	11.8388	5.6850	9.8792	6.0694
Domestic capital form.	201.9704	4.6504	64.8381	423.5972	11.0109	4.3475	11.9658	6.9493	12.8823	6.1828
Gross fixed cap.form.	201.0424	4.6504	62.4989	422.8940	11.0437	4.3372	11.6649	7.1814	13.1430	6.2715
Construction	225.3295	4.6269	53.1465	383.5158	9.4808	2.8160	18.1332	6.0830	12.4248	4.9799
Residential build.	243.8549	5.9583	51.1448	321.0263	9.9491	4.1539	27.2052	5.3222	14.0937	4.3780
Non-res.build.	227.3688	4.0128	55.2373	327.9175	9.2890	1.2531	12.3601	6.5283	10.5735	6.0014
Other construction	212.8834	3.3565	60.3565	493.9623	9.2806	3.0401	25.3774	6.1017	10.9467	5.0193
Land improvement	215.9383	3.4034	0.0000	501.0879	9.4137	3.0837	25.7416	6.1894	11.1037	0.0000
Producer durables	171.1581	4.6832	110.4747	505.2601	13.7852	17.1886	7.3164	9.1372	14.4734	8.4785
Transport equipm.	146.0193	6.4880	197.1443	738.9042	28.0514	26.3595	35.8229	20.3403	52.0754	9.1667
Machinery and equipm.	182.9912	4.8098	78.6111	444.8801	19.8419	13.4120	9.1236	8.0800	9.2436	7.0843
Electrical mach.	171.0421	4.4347	97.7939	476.4296	27.6674	16.1634	5.0915	6.1674	19.2255	10.5660
Other prod.dur.	188.2863	3.1034	80.2331	409.5804	5.4590	10.4821	7.0473	4.6490	28.6008	8.1672
Change in stocks	238.3731	4.6879	75.2921	517.0267	10.4216	7.0351	7.9380	5.3850	8.8296	5.8524
Net foreign balance	143.2282	4.6879	52.9309	523.4960	16.3270	16.3424	11.2748	9.5839	18.6531	7.4425
GDP	222.0660	4.6879	69.2775	460.3033	8.1077	5.2968	6.3071	3.7672	6.0849	4.6752

Table A.7 Price indices (PPPs divided by exchange rates to the United States dollar),1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
	yen	Hong Kong dollars	Iranian rials	won	baht	Sri Lanka rupees	Philippines pesos	Pakistan rupees	taka	Indian rupees
Consumption	97.3%	57.5%	76.3%	53.7%	29.1%	25.5%	32.7%	25.5%	20.9%	35.9
Food, bev. and tob.	96.6%	47.4%	80.6%	56.7%	27.4%	28.6%	30.8%	24.8%	22.5%	36.8
Food	103.0%	47.1%	78.1%	59.4%	24.4%	26.3%	30.9%	24.3%	22.6%	36.1
Bread,cer.	109.9%	40.5%	72.3%	54.4%	17.1%	23.8%	28.1%	24.6%	22.4%	39.1
Meat	110.4%	43.2%	93.0%	64.0%	27.0%	15.5%	33.1%	17.7%	15.9%	26.4
Fish	120.8%	53.6%	152.4%	71.9%	23.9%	20.1%	24.6%	14.8%	23.3%	22.1
Milk,cheese	85.0%	44.4%	78.8%	73.5%	37.9%	31.7%	42.5%	30.6%	30.4%	35.2
Oils, fats	50.9%	38.9%	47.3%	53.3%	31.0%	30.5%	33.7%	24.4%	32.7%	41.0
Fruits,vegetabl.	115.4%	53.3%	81.8%	57.2%	23.4%	30.3%	45.2%	24.9%	19.2%	32.8
Other food	84.1%	53.9%	51.7%	63.5%	49.7%	33.6%	36.1%	30.5%	30.5%	38.9
Beverages	83.2%	47.7%	68.0%	45.8%	45.6%	43.8%	30.4%	28.7%	43.0%	52.4
Non-alc.	89.4%	49.9%	68.0%	48.4%	35.1%	27.5%	33.7%	28.7%	28.0%	44.2
Alcoholic	81.1%	46.1%	0.0%	44.9%	54.1%	44.4%	28.1%	0.0%	51.5%	53.0
Tobacco	68.3%	51.0%	175.7%	46.6%	46.9%	49.7%	29.9%	28.3%	21.3%	45.8
Clothing,footw.	87.9%	52.2%	72.5%	45.8%	42.9%	18.9%	30.0%	18.3%	20.4%	43.2
Clothing	88.3%	53.1%	71.4%	44.7%	43.2%	17.7%	32.7%	17.0%	20.0%	42.7
Footwear	84.1%	46.4%	77.2%	50.7%	34.2%	25.1%	23.0%	34.0%	24.2%	49.5
Gross rents,fuel & power	93.0%	116.3%	82.7%	67.8%	29.9%	34.5%	55.8%	35.5%	21.8%	27.9
Gross rents	89.8%	127.6%	104.7%	66.2%	29.6%	48.3%	71.6%	52.5%	21.8%	24.1
Fuel and power	112.7%	72.0%	28.8%	69.9%	30.4%	27.4%	35.4%	20.2%	21.6%	41.1
House furnishings	90.2%	49.8%	94.6%	42.1%	30.0%	22.8%	33.9%	33.7%	24.5%	41.8
Furniture	122.8%	45.5%	82.1%	52.5%	20.1%	12.5%	37.5%	26.5%	21.7%	31.4
Household textiles	100.6%	50.9%	96.6%	24.5%	34.2%	25.8%	79.2%	24.6%	43.1%	0.0
Appliances	77.0%	42.6%	108.5%	55.0%	41.5%	52.3%	50.2%	42.1%	13.4%	69.9
Other househ.goods	91.6%	56.0%	92.0%	47.2%	34.6%	24.7%	28.0%	32.7%	27.4%	38.7
Medical care	97.7%	75.9%	74.5%	66.0%	27.9%	14.3%	43.2%	9.5%	27.8%	33.0
Pharmac.prod	100.5%	82.6%	62.1%	136.1%	26.0%	21.9%	60.3%	24.3%	17.0%	33.2
Health serv.	97.5%	74.2%	80.1%	47.8%	34.0%	9.9%	29.9%	7.4%	28.4%	32.5
Transport,comm.	96.3%	58.7%	51.3%	54.2%	30.6%	27.5%	74.4%	28.5%	11.1%	39.2
Transport equipm.	59.0%	85.6%	503.9%	63.0%	59.5%	76.4%	110.4%	85.7%	100.0%	49.1
Operation costs	91.1%	91.3%	54.7%	49.4%	38.2%	25.3%	49.2%	19.7%	12.3%	58.4
Purchased transp.serv.	141.6%	52.6%	33.0%	57.3%	27.4%	27.1%	68.5%	14.6%	10.6%	33.9
Communication	93.9%	50.1%	65.7%	42.1%	49.5%	15.7%	48.4%	32.5%	0.0%	49.9
Recreation,education	102.1%	60.4%	103.1%	57.8%	23.2%	14.6%	16.3%	33.8%	10.2%	28.5
Equipm.for recr.	82.2%	60.9%	219.8%	50.6%	44.8%	72.5%	67.4%	63.4%	57.9%	91.8
Recr. serv.	95.0%	42.8%	57.6%	56.2%	40.8%	11.9%	15.4%	37.8%	13.0%	30.5
Books,newspapers	88.2%	76.8%	84.1%	64.7%	39.8%	51.0%	35.2%	50.0%	20.8%	37.6
Education	118.8%	87.3%	97.7%	59.8%	17.7%	10.3%	15.4%	11.4%	8.0%	25.6
Misc.goods,serv.	109.4%	47.9%	47.8%	37.2%	24.9%	20.0%	22.6%	15.6%	12.6%	38.7
Restaurants,etc	97.8%	69.8%	49.3%	44.6%	33.5%	26.2%	31.0%	14.2%	11.0%	44.1
Net exp.of res.abroad	53.3%	60.2%	0.0%	47.0%	25.0%	60.2%	0.0%	0.0%	20.9%	30.6
Government	157.7%	119.5%	119.9%	67.1%	22.9%	12.9%	18.9%	14.2%	9.5%	31.4
Capital formation	81.3%	59.8%	72.8%	48.9%	40.2%	9.0%	63.2%	35.7%	31.9%	49.1
Domestic capital form.	84.8%	59.7%	73.7%	48.7%	40.6%	16.0%	63.9%	43.6%	41.6%	50.0
Gross fixed cap.form.	84.5%	59.7%	71.0%	48.6%	40.7%	16.0%	62.3%	45.1%	42.4%	50.7
Construction	94.7%	59.4%	60.4%	44.1%	34.9%	10.4%	96.8%	38.2%	40.1%	40.3
Residential build.	102.4%	76.5%	58.1%	36.9%	36.7%	15.3%	145.2%	33.4%	45.5%	35.4
Non-res.build.	95.5%	51.5%	62.8%	37.7%	34.2%	4.6%	66.0%	41.0%	34.1%	48.5
Other construction	89.4%	43.1%	68.6%	56.8%	34.2%	11.2%	135.4%	38.3%	35.3%	40.6
Land improvement	90.7%	43.7%	0.0%	57.6%	34.7%	11.4%	137.4%	38.9%	35.8%	0.0
Producer durables	71.9%	60.1%	125.6%	58.1%	50.8%	63.3%	39.0%	57.4%	46.7%	68.5
Transport equipm.	61.3%	83.3%	224.1%	84.9%	103.4%	97.1%	191.2%	127.7%	168.0%	74.1
Machinery and equipm.	76.9%	61.7%	89.4%	51.1%	73.1%	49.4%	48.7%	50.7%	29.8%	57.3
Electrical mach.	71.9%	56.9%	111.2%	54.8%	102.0%	59.5%	27.2%	38.7%	62.0%	85.4
Other prod.dur.	79.1%	39.8%	91.2%	47.1%	20.1%	38.6%	37.6%	29.2%	92.3%	66.0
Change in stocks	100.1%	60.2%	85.6%	59.4%	38.4%	25.9%	42.4%	33.8%	28.5%	47.3
Net foreign balance	60.2%	60.2%	60.2%	60.2%	60.2%	60.2%	60.2%	60.2%	60.2%	60.2
GDP	93.3%	60.2%	78.8%	52.9%	29.9%	19.5%	33.7%	23.7%	19.6%	37.8

Table A.8/i Relative price indices, 1985 (PPP of the GDP=100)

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
Consumption	104.3%	95.6%	96.9%	101.4%	97.5%	130.7%	97.1%	107.8%	106.3%	94.9%
Food, bev. and tob.	103.6%	78.8%	102.4%	107.1%	91.6%	146.6%	91.6%	104.9%	114.8%	97.4%
Food	110.4%	78.3%	99.2%	112.2%	81.6%	134.7%	91.8%	102.8%	115.1%	95.6%
Bread,cer.	117.8%	67.3%	91.8%	102.9%	57.1%	122.1%	83.6%	103.9%	114.2%	103.4%
Meat	118.4%	71.8%	118.1%	120.9%	90.3%	79.6%	98.3%	74.7%	81.1%	69.9%
Fish	129.4%	89.0%	193.6%	135.8%	80.1%	103.2%	73.1%	62.6%	118.7%	58.5%
Milk,cheese	91.1%	73.8%	100.0%	139.0%	126.8%	162.8%	126.3%	129.5%	155.1%	93.2%
Oils, fats	54.5%	64.6%	60.1%	100.7%	103.7%	156.2%	100.1%	103.2%	166.8%	108.6%
Fruits,vegetabl.	123.7%	88.5%	103.8%	108.0%	78.4%	155.6%	134.3%	105.2%	97.9%	86.7%
Other food	90.1%	89.5%	65.7%	120.0%	166.3%	172.1%	107.3%	129.1%	155.5%	103.0%
Beverages	89.2%	79.2%	86.4%	86.6%	152.7%	224.5%	90.4%	121.4%	219.1%	138.5%
Non-alc.	95.8%	82.9%	86.4%	91.5%	117.4%	141.3%	100.0%	121.4%	142.6%	116.8%
Alcoholic	86.9%	76.6%	0.0%	84.9%	181.0%	227.6%	83.4%	0.0%	262.5%	140.1%
Tobacco	73.2%	84.7%	223.1%	88.1%	157.0%	254.7%	88.7%	119.5%	108.7%	121.2%
Clothing,footw.	94.2%	86.7%	92.0%	86.5%	143.6%	96.7%	89.1%	77.2%	103.7%	114.3%
Clothing	94.7%	88.2%	90.6%	84.5%	144.5%	90.8%	97.2%	71.7%	102.0%	113.1%
Footwear	90.2%	77.1%	98.0%	95.8%	114.4%	128.7%	68.4%	143.6%	123.3%	131.0%
Gross rents,fuel& power	99.7%	193.3%	105.0%	128.1%	100.2%	177.1%	165.9%	150.3%	110.8%	73.8%
Gross rents	96.3%	212.0%	133.0%	125.1%	99.1%	247.6%	212.7%	222.0%	111.2%	63.7%
Fuel and power	120.9%	119.7%	36.6%	132.2%	101.6%	140.7%	105.1%	85.6%	110.2%	108.8%
House furnishings	96.7%	82.8%	120.1%	79.5%	100.3%	116.7%	100.7%	142.6%	124.9%	110.6%
Furniture	131.7%	75.6%	104.3%	99.3%	67.1%	64.0%	111.5%	112.0%	110.7%	83.2%
Household textiles	107.9%	84.6%	122.7%	46.3%	114.6%	132.4%	235.2%	104.2%	219.7%	0.0%
Appliances	82.6%	70.8%	137.8%	103.9%	139.0%	268.1%	149.2%	177.9%	68.3%	184.9%
Other househ.goods	98.2%	93.0%	116.8%	89.2%	115.7%	126.4%	83.2%	138.4%	139.5%	102.5%
Medical care	104.7%	126.2%	94.6%	124.7%	93.4%	73.1%	128.4%	40.2%	141.6%	87.2%
Pharmac.prod	107.7%	137.3%	78.9%	257.3%	86.9%	112.3%	179.0%	102.8%	86.7%	87.9%
Health serv.	104.5%	123.3%	101.7%	90.4%	113.9%	50.7%	89.0%	31.2%	144.8%	85.9%
Transport,comm.	103.2%	97.5%	65.2%	102.4%	102.6%	141.1%	220.9%	120.4%	56.8%	103.8%
Transport equipm.	63.3%	142.2%	639.8%	119.0%	199.2%	391.8%	328.1%	362.3%	509.5%	130.0%
Operation costs	97.6%	151.8%	69.4%	93.4%	127.8%	129.9%	146.0%	83.3%	62.7%	154.4%
Purchased transp.serv.	151.8%	87.5%	41.8%	108.3%	91.6%	139.0%	203.5%	61.9%	54.1%	89.7%
Communication	100.7%	83.3%	83.4%	79.5%	165.5%	80.5%	143.7%	137.4%	0.0%	131.9%
Recreation,education	109.4%	100.3%	130.9%	109.2%	77.5%	74.7%	48.4%	142.9%	52.2%	75.4%
Equipm.for recr.	88.1%	101.2%	279.1%	95.5%	150.1%	371.6%	200.3%	268.1%	295.2%	242.9%
Recr. serv.	101.9%	71.1%	73.2%	106.3%	136.6%	60.9%	45.8%	160.0%	66.3%	80.8%
Books,newspapers	94.5%	127.6%	106.8%	122.3%	133.1%	261.6%	104.7%	211.5%	106.2%	99.6%
Education	127.4%	145.1%	124.1%	113.1%	59.2%	52.8%	45.8%	48.0%	40.7%	67.8%
Misc.goods,serv.	117.2%	79.6%	60.8%	70.4%	83.4%	102.3%	67.2%	65.9%	64.4%	102.5%
Restaurants,etc	104.8%	116.0%	62.6%	84.3%	112.2%	134.2%	92.1%	60.2%	55.8%	116.6%
Net exp.of res.abroad	57.2%	100.0%	0.0%	88.9%	83.7%	308.5%	0.0%	0.0%	106.7%	80.9%
Government	169.0%	198.6%	152.3%	126.9%	76.7%	66.2%	56.1%	60.0%	48.5%	83.2%
Capital formation	87.1%	99.4%	92.5%	92.3%	134.7%	46.3%	187.7%	150.9%	162.4%	129.8%
Domestic capital form.	91.0%	99.2%	93.6%	92.0%	135.8%	82.1%	189.7%	184.5%	211.7%	132.2%
Gross fixed cap.form.	90.5%	99.2%	90.2%	91.9%	136.2%	81.9%	184.9%	190.6%	216.0%	134.1%
Construction	101.5%	98.7%	76.7%	83.3%	116.9%	53.2%	287.5%	161.5%	204.2%	106.5%
Residential build.	109.8%	127.1%	73.8%	69.7%	122.7%	78.4%	431.3%	141.3%	231.6%	93.6%
Non-res.build.	102.4%	85.6%	79.7%	71.2%	114.6%	23.7%	196.0%	173.3%	173.8%	128.4%
Other construction	95.9%	71.6%	87.1%	107.3%	114.5%	57.4%	402.4%	162.0%	179.9%	107.4%
Land improvement	97.2%	72.6%	0.0%	108.9%	116.1%	58.2%	408.1%	164.3%	182.5%	0.0%
Producer durables	77.1%	99.9%	159.5%	109.8%	170.0%	324.5%	116.0%	242.5%	237.9%	181.3%
Transport equipm.	65.8%	138.4%	284.6%	160.5%	346.0%	497.6%	568.0%	539.9%	855.8%	196.1%
Machinery and equipm.	82.4%	102.6%	113.5%	96.6%	244.7%	253.2%	144.7%	214.5%	151.9%	151.5%
Electrical mach.	77.0%	94.6%	141.2%	103.5%	341.2%	305.2%	80.7%	163.7%	316.0%	226.0%
Other prod.dur.	84.8%	66.2%	115.8%	89.0%	67.3%	197.9%	111.7%	123.4%	470.0%	174.7%
Change in stocks	107.3%	100.0%	108.7%	112.3%	128.5%	132.8%	125.9%	142.9%	145.1%	125.2%
Net foreign balance	64.5%	100.0%	76.4%	113.7%	201.4%	308.5%	178.8%	254.4%	306.5%	159.2%
GDP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table A.8/ii Relative price indices, 1985 (PPP of the total private final consumption=100)

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
Consumption	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Food, bev. and tob.	99.3%	82.4%	105.7%	105.6%	93.9%	112.2%	94.3%	97.3%	108.0%	102.6%
Food	105.8%	81.9%	102.4%	110.7%	83.7%	103.0%	94.5%	95.4%	108.3%	100.7%
Bread,cer.	112.9%	70.4%	94.7%	101.5%	58.5%	93.4%	86.1%	96.4%	107.4%	108.9%
Meat	113.4%	75.1%	121.9%	119.3%	92.6%	60.9%	101.2%	69.3%	76.3%	73.6%
Fish	124.1%	93.1%	199.8%	133.9%	82.1%	78.9%	75.3%	58.1%	111.6%	61.6%
Milk,cheese	87.3%	77.2%	103.3%	137.1%	130.0%	124.5%	130.1%	120.1%	145.9%	98.2%
Oils, fats	52.3%	67.6%	62.1%	99.3%	106.3%	119.5%	103.0%	95.7%	156.9%	114.4%
Fruits,vegetabl.	118.5%	92.6%	107.2%	106.5%	80.4%	119.0%	138.3%	97.6%	92.1%	91.3%
Other food	86.4%	93.6%	67.8%	118.3%	170.5%	131.7%	110.5%	119.8%	146.2%	108.5%
Beverages	85.5%	82.8%	89.1%	85.4%	156.6%	171.7%	93.1%	112.6%	206.0%	145.9%
Non-alc.	91.8%	86.7%	89.1%	90.2%	120.3%	108.0%	103.0%	112.6%	134.1%	123.1%
Alcoholic	83.3%	80.1%	0.0%	83.7%	185.6%	174.1%	85.8%	0.0%	246.9%	147.6%
Tobacco	70.1%	88.6%	230.3%	86.8%	160.9%	194.8%	91.4%	110.8%	102.3%	127.6%
Clothing,footw.	90.3%	90.7%	95.0%	85.3%	147.2%	74.0%	91.7%	71.6%	97.6%	120.4%
Clothing	90.8%	92.3%	93.5%	83.4%	148.2%	69.5%	100.0%	66.5%	95.9%	119.1%
Footwear	86.4%	80.6%	101.2%	94.5%	117.3%	98.4%	70.4%	133.2%	116.0%	137.9%
Gross rents,fuel& power	95.5%	202.2%	108.3%	126.4%	102.7%	135.4%	170.9%	139.4%	104.2%	77.7%
Gross rents	92.2%	221.8%	137.3%	123.4%	101.6%	189.4%	219.0%	205.9%	104.6%	67.1%
Fuel and power	115.8%	125.2%	37.8%	130.4%	104.2%	107.6%	108.2%	79.3%	103.7%	114.6%
House furnishings	92.7%	86.6%	124.0%	78.4%	102.8%	89.2%	103.7%	132.3%	117.4%	116.5%
Furniture	126.2%	79.1%	107.6%	97.9%	68.8%	48.9%	114.8%	103.9%	104.1%	87.6%
Household textiles	103.4%	88.5%	126.7%	45.6%	117.5%	101.3%	242.2%	96.6%	206.7%	0.0%
Appliances	79.1%	74.1%	142.2%	102.4%	142.6%	205.1%	153.7%	165.0%	64.2%	194.8%
Other househ.goods	94.2%	97.3%	120.6%	87.9%	118.6%	96.7%	85.7%	128.3%	131.2%	108.0%
Medical care	100.3%	132.0%	97.6%	123.0%	95.7%	56.0%	132.2%	37.3%	133.2%	91.8%
Pharmac.prod	103.3%	143.6%	81.4%	253.7%	89.1%	85.9%	184.3%	95.4%	81.5%	92.6%
Health serv.	100.1%	129.0%	105.0%	89.2%	116.8%	38.8%	91.6%	28.9%	136.2%	90.5%
Transport,comm.	98.9%	102.0%	67.3%	101.0%	105.2%	107.9%	227.5%	111.7%	53.4%	109.3%
Transport equipm.	60.6%	148.7%	660.4%	117.4%	204.2%	299.7%	337.9%	336.1%	479.2%	136.9%
Operation costs	93.6%	158.8%	71.7%	92.1%	131.1%	99.4%	150.4%	77.2%	59.0%	162.6%
Purchased transp.serv.	145.5%	91.5%	43.2%	106.8%	94.0%	106.4%	209.6%	57.4%	50.9%	94.4%
Communication	96.5%	87.1%	86.1%	78.4%	169.7%	61.6%	148.0%	127.5%	0.0%	139.0%
Recreation,education	104.9%	104.9%	135.1%	107.7%	79.5%	57.1%	49.9%	132.5%	49.1%	79.4%
Equipm.for recr.	84.4%	105.9%	288.1%	94.2%	153.9%	284.2%	206.2%	248.6%	277.6%	255.8%
Recr. serv.	97.6%	74.4%	75.6%	104.8%	140.1%	46.6%	47.1%	148.4%	62.3%	85.1%
Books,newspapers	90.6%	133.5%	110.3%	120.6%	136.5%	200.1%	107.8%	196.2%	99.9%	104.9%
Education	122.1%	151.8%	128.1%	111.5%	60.7%	40.4%	47.1%	44.6%	38.3%	71.4%
Misc.goods,serv.	112.4%	83.3%	62.7%	69.4%	85.5%	78.3%	69.2%	61.1%	60.5%	107.9%
Restaurants,etc	100.4%	121.3%	64.7%	83.2%	115.0%	102.7%	94.8%	55.8%	52.5%	122.8%
Net exp.of res.abroad	54.8%	104.6%	0.0%	87.6%	85.8%	236.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.4%	85.2%

Table A.9 Per capita quantity indices,1985 (ESCAP average=100)

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
Consumption	486.2	483.1	213.4	164.3	118.8	74.8	93.8	63.4	43.7	36.6
Food, bev. and tob.	282.5	244.0	228.3	185.7	138.5	100.7	159.1	79.7	72.8	56.3
Food	243.8	228.8	253.2	168.8	136.6	102.6	166.4	80.3	77.7	60.7
Bread,cereals	153.6	99.6	201.2	232.1	149.5	134.0	231.0	81.7	148.7	60.3
Meat	264.8	687.1	587.1	221.9	179.4	33.2	202.5	92.0	68.5	25.6
Fish	448.5	364.9	21.4	124.6	293.9	144.5	353.6	72.6	63.3	21.8
Milk,cheese	177.3	120.9	280.0	81.1	51.9	43.4	87.1	94.6	25.9	92.9
Oils, fats	97.3	192.6	208.8	44.0	47.1	21.1	53.1	142.7	46.6	106.0
Fruits,vegetabl.	214.3	216.5	339.6	195.9	138.8	136.9	71.2	54.4	47.7	71.9
Other food	427.3	166.9	159.6	105.2	64.0	94.4	93.5	68.7	29.5	59.4
Beverages	643.1	443.7	17.6	322.8	217.5	66.0	98.0	46.9	1.3	16.4
Non-alc.	558.9	624.8	59.8	288.0	328.8	8.2	139.9	159.1	1.6	3.8
Alcoholic	678.2	368.1	0.0	337.4	171.0	90.1	80.6	0.0	1.2	21.6
Tobacco	453.7	251.6	95.7	281.9	83.1	110.4	119.9	104.5	77.7	34.5
Clothing,footw.	407.9	648.4	257.6	157.9	166.2	88.0	52.8	73.7	43.8	43.6
Clothing	407.8	627.9	323.7	145.8	180.5	83.3	42.5	76.1	45.0	45.4
Footwear	408.7	819.3	464.2	259.0	48.0	127.2	137.7	53.1	34.0	28.6
Gross rents,fuel& power	573.6	228.1	296.8	88.4	53.7	20.0	69.6	48.9	48.0	31.9
Gross rents	632.4	233.1	270.0	65.4	38.2	8.8	50.5	29.8	38.5	31.8
Fuel and power	365.1	210.5	392.1	170.2	108.6	60.0	137.2	116.7	81.5	32.3
House furnishings	578.1	714.2	217.1	203.8	144.9	81.6	83.4	46.1	26.3	21.1
Furniture	316.1	1282.4	401.1	154.7	399.3	174.8	44.6	59.0	69.2	26.3
Household textiles	618.7	128.9	382.5	523.1	39.7	10.5	12.4	88.8	20.5	0.0
Appliances	722.5	765.8	199.4	132.8	26.1	14.8	63.8	73.8	18.4	11.0
Other househ.goods	558.8	687.2	142.1	176.6	168.2	109.7	119.8	18.7	21.3	30.1
Medical care	742.1	336.0	188.5	95.0	102.4	44.1	24.8	25.3	9.9	18.2
Pharmac.prod	240.1	378.8	322.9	107.6	429.7	88.7	59.9	17.5	3.0	65.1
Health serv.	853.1	326.5	158.8	92.2	30.0	34.2	17.0	27.0	11.4	7.8
Transport,comm.	506.2	492.2	227.5	177.1	179.0	129.7	19.8	90.9	31.5	29.9
Transport equipm.	895.4	139.3	29.3	29.1	30.4	19.1	48.9	96.4	0.7	4.4
Operation costs	630.6	210.4	268.0	57.6	117.0	38.5	26.6	136.0	11.9	18.3
Purchased transp.se	280.5	768.3	275.6	262.1	284.3	226.4	5.1	74.4	57.8	46.9
Communication	691.6	510.4	164.1	383.7	41.9	82.4	29.8	14.6	0.4	16.3
Recreation,education	654.8	815.6	79.1	195.5	106.1	71.1	61.6	42.1	14.7	23.8
Equipm.for recr.	817.2	1994.2	30.1	201.7	61.7	14.6	2.8	30.0	1.7	3.8
Recr. serv.	735.8	1084.2	12.5	115.7	35.8	102.2	23.0	105.9	17.2	15.8
Books,newspapers	814.4	709.1	38.3	106.6	123.0	66.6	39.2	15.1	3.1	12.1
Education	548.6	327.2	130.7	240.9	152.2	74.2	100.9	17.9	18.6	35.2
Misc.goods,serv.	657.5	1229.8	156.6	198.1	121.8	27.1	80.9	54.5	11.9	12.6
Restaurants,etc	751.3	1111.3	140.7	125.6	143.1	14.9	81.8	32.3	1.1	6.4
Net exp.of res.abroad	-34511.7	98450.4	0.0	8345.6	40365.6	-9843.4	0.0	0.0	966.6	1860.7
Government	218.4	202.1	212.9	153.2	272.9	158.4	139.4	185.4	82.4	45.7
Capital formation	698.9	451.8	179.5	212.7	68.7	76.8	25.8	14.4	7.3	21.6
Domestic capital form	652.8	392.5	183.5	229.0	76.4	97.1	23.0	23.4	12.2	25.8
Gross fixed cap.form	680.3	408.7	160.2	242.9	77.3	103.5	26.6	21.8	12.2	21.7
Construction	629.1	396.3	224.7	275.5	82.5	155.1	17.9	23.4	13.3	23.0
Residential build.	527.9	502.7	499.0	265.8	77.0	145.7	10.3	15.9	20.6	22.7
Non-res.build.	668.3	531.0	131.3	370.1	81.4	185.1	40.0	28.9	8.5	14.2
Other construction	649.5	224.3	92.0	219.4	98.3	117.0	8.4	22.5	10.8	33.3
Land improvement	865.1	294.5	0.0	254.1	19.8	305.9	20.1	43.6	10.9	0.0
Producer durables	756.1	427.1	64.7	194.6	69.5	27.1	39.4	19.4	10.6	19.9
Transport equipm.	831.1	194.3	69.4	162.6	29.5	26.5	3.6	8.8	2.5	18.8
Machinery and equi	748.7	465.7	63.6	200.1	52.0	25.9	27.7	37.1	17.3	19.4
Electrical mach.	778.9	570.1	40.4	214.3	20.2	38.7	76.0	5.5	9.1	18.1
Other prod.dur.	564.1	429.0	119.4	194.4	353.2	5.1	77.0	3.2	4.3	28.5
Change in stocks	253.0	157.2	521.6	26.9	63.3	5.5	-28.9	46.9	11.4	84.6
Net foreign balance	1199.9	1096.8	137.0	36.1	-14.1	-144.5	56.4	-82.7	-45.5	-23.3
GDP	525.3	454.2	204.1	176.8	116.2	81.4	78.5	58.8	36.5	33.1

Table A.10 Relative quantity indices (quantity index of GDP=100), 1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India
Consumption	92.6%	106.4%	104.6%	92.9%	102.2%	91.9%	119.5%	107.8%	119.7%	110.6%
Food, bev. and tob.	53.8%	53.7%	111.9%	105.0%	119.2%	123.7%	202.7%	135.5%	199.5%	170.1%
Food	46.4%	50.4%	124.1%	95.5%	117.6%	126.0%	212.0%	136.6%	212.9%	183.4%
Bread,cereals	29.2%	21.9%	98.6%	131.3%	128.7%	164.6%	294.3%	138.9%	407.4%	182.2%
Meat	50.4%	151.3%	287.7%	125.5%	154.4%	40.8%	258.0%	156.5%	187.7%	77.3%
Fish	85.4%	80.3%	10.5%	70.5%	252.9%	177.5%	450.4%	123.5%	173.4%	65.9%
Milk,cheese	33.8%	26.6%	137.2%	45.9%	44.7%	53.3%	111.0%	160.9%	71.0%	280.7%
Oils, fats	18.5%	42.4%	102.3%	24.9%	40.5%	25.9%	67.6%	242.7%	127.7%	320.2%
Fruits,vegetabl.	40.8%	47.7%	166.4%	110.8%	119.4%	168.2%	90.7%	92.5%	130.7%	217.2%
Other food	81.3%	36.7%	78.2%	59.5%	55.1%	116.0%	119.1%	116.8%	80.8%	179.5%
Beverages	122.4%	97.7%	8.6%	182.6%	187.2%	81.1%	124.8%	79.8%	3.6%	49.5%
Non-alc.	106.4%	137.6%	29.3%	162.9%	283.0%	10.1%	178.2%	270.6%	4.4%	11.5%
Alcoholic	129.1%	81.0%	0.0%	190.8%	147.2%	110.7%	102.7%	0.0%	3.3%	65.3%
Tobacco	86.4%	55.4%	46.9%	159.4%	71.5%	135.6%	152.7%	177.7%	212.9%	104.2%
Clothing,footw.	77.7%	142.8%	126.2%	89.3%	143.0%	108.1%	67.3%	125.3%	120.0%	131.7%
Clothing	77.6%	138.2%	158.6%	82.5%	155.3%	102.3%	54.1%	129.4%	123.3%	137.2%
Footwear	77.8%	180.4%	227.4%	146.5%	41.3%	156.3%	175.4%	90.3%	93.2%	86.4%
Gross rents,fuel& power	109.2%	50.2%	145.4%	50.0%	46.2%	24.6%	88.7%	83.2%	131.5%	96.4%
Gross rents	120.4%	51.3%	132.3%	37.0%	32.9%	10.8%	64.3%	50.7%	105.5%	96.1%
Fuel and power	69.5%	46.3%	192.1%	96.3%	93.5%	73.7%	174.8%	198.5%	223.3%	97.6%
House furnishings	110.1%	157.2%	106.4%	115.3%	124.7%	100.2%	106.2%	78.4%	72.1%	63.7%
Furniture	60.2%	282.3%	196.5%	87.5%	343.6%	214.7%	56.8%	100.3%	189.6%	79.5%
Household textiles	117.8%	28.4%	187.4%	295.9%	34.2%	12.9%	15.8%	151.0%	56.2%	0.0%
Appliances	137.5%	168.6%	97.7%	75.1%	22.5%	18.2%	81.3%	125.5%	50.4%	33.2%
Other househ.goods	106.4%	151.3%	69.6%	99.9%	144.8%	134.8%	152.6%	31.8%	58.4%	90.9%
Medical care	141.3%	74.0%	92.4%	53.7%	88.1%	54.2%	31.6%	43.0%	27.1%	55.0%
Pharmac.prod	45.7%	83.4%	158.2%	60.9%	369.8%	109.0%	76.3%	29.8%	8.2%	196.7%
Health serv.	162.4%	71.9%	77.8%	52.1%	25.8%	42.0%	21.7%	45.9%	31.2%	23.6%
Transport,comm.	96.4%	108.4%	111.5%	100.2%	154.0%	159.3%	25.2%	154.6%	86.3%	90.3%
Transport equipm.	170.5%	30.7%	14.4%	16.5%	26.2%	23.5%	62.3%	163.9%	1.9%	13.3%
Operation costs	120.0%	46.3%	131.3%	32.6%	100.7%	47.3%	33.9%	231.3%	32.6%	55.3%
Purchased transp.serv.	53.4%	169.2%	135.0%	148.2%	244.7%	278.1%	6.5%	126.5%	158.4%	141.7%
Communication	131.7%	112.4%	80.4%	217.0%	36.1%	101.2%	38.0%	24.8%	1.1%	49.2%
Recreation,education	124.7%	179.6%	38.8%	110.6%	91.3%	87.3%	78.5%	71.6%	40.3%	71.9%
Equipm.for recr.	155.6%	439.1%	14.7%	114.1%	53.1%	17.9%	3.6%	51.0%	4.7%	11.5%
Recr. serv.	140.1%	238.7%	6.1%	65.4%	30.8%	125.6%	29.3%	180.1%	47.1%	47.7%
Books,newspapers	155.0%	156.1%	18.8%	60.3%	105.9%	81.8%	49.9%	25.7%	8.5%	36.6%
Education	104.4%	72.0%	64.0%	136.3%	131.0%	91.2%	128.5%	30.4%	51.0%	106.3%
Misc.goods,serv.	125.2%	270.8%	76.7%	112.0%	104.8%	33.3%	103.1%	92.7%	32.6%	38.1%
Restaurants,etc	143.0%	244.7%	68.9%	71.0%	123.1%	18.3%	104.2%	54.9%	3.0%	19.3%
Net exp.of res.abroad	-6569.9%	21675.6%	0.0%	4720.4%	34738.0%	-12092.6%	0.0%	0.0%	2648.2%	5621.5%
Government	41.6%	44.5%	104.3%	86.7%	234.9%	194.6%	177.6%	315.3%	225.8%	138.1%
Capital formation	133.0%	99.5%	87.9%	120.3%	59.1%	94.3%	32.9%	24.5%	20.0%	65.3%
Domestic capital form.	124.3%	86.4%	89.9%	129.5%	65.7%	119.3%	29.3%	39.8%	33.4%	77.9%
Gross fixed cap.form.	129.5%	90.0%	78.5%	137.4%	66.5%	127.1%	33.9%	37.1%	33.4%	65.6%
Construction	119.8%	87.3%	110.1%	155.8%	71.0%	190.5%	22.8%	39.8%	36.4%	69.5%
Residential build.	100.5%	110.7%	244.5%	150.3%	66.3%	179.0%	13.1%	27.0%	56.4%	68.6%
Non-res.build.	127.2%	116.9%	64.3%	209.3%	70.1%	227.4%	51.0%	49.1%	23.3%	42.9%
Other construction	123.6%	49.4%	45.1%	124.1%	84.6%	143.7%	10.7%	38.3%	29.6%	100.6%
Land improvement	164.7%	64.8%	0.0%	143.7%	17.0%	375.8%	25.6%	74.1%	29.9%	0.0%
Producer durables	143.9%	94.0%	31.7%	110.1%	59.8%	33.3%	50.2%	33.0%	29.0%	60.1%
Transport equipm.	158.2%	42.8%	34.0%	92.0%	25.4%	32.6%	4.6%	15.0%	6.8%	56.8%
Machinery and equipm.	142.5%	102.5%	31.2%	113.2%	44.8%	31.8%	35.3%	63.1%	47.4%	58.6%
Electrical mach.	148.3%	125.5%	19.8%	121.2%	17.4%	47.5%	96.8%	9.4%	24.9%	54.7%
Other prod.dur.	107.4%	94.5%	58.5%	110.0%	304.0%	6.3%	98.1%	5.4%	11.8%	86.1%
Change in stocks	48.2%	34.6%	255.6%	15.2%	54.5%	6.8%	-36.8%	79.8%	31.2%	255.6%
Net foreign balance	228.4%	241.5%	67.1%	20.4%	-12.1%	-177.5%	71.8%	-140.6%	-124.7%	-70.4%
GDP	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table B.1. Total final consumption of Nepal at national and Asian average prices, 1985

	Total final in national prices, (Millions of Napalese rupees)	Consumption in Asian average prices, (Millions of Asian dollars)	PPP, Nepalese rupees per Asian dollars	Price index: PPP per exchange rate	Relative price level: PPP of components in percentage of global PPP	Percentage distribution of final consumption in national prices	Percentage distribution of final consumption in Asian average prices
Consumption	33 958	8 137	4.1735	22.84%	108.6%	91.5%	84.2%
Food, bev. and tob.	20 191	5 088	3.9684	21.72%	103.3%	54.4%	52.7%
Food	19 324	4 877	3.9620	21.68%	103.1%	52.0%	50.5%
Bread,cer.	12 382	3 484	3.5538	19.45%	92.5%	33.3%	36.1%
Meat	684	181	3.7795	20.68%	98.3%	1.8%	1.9%
Fish	133	30	4.3874	24.01%	114.2%	0.4%	0.3%
Milk,cheese	1 118	196	5.7074	31.23%	148.5%	3.0%	2.0%
Oils, fats	918	185	4.9588	27.14%	129.0%	2.5%	1.9%
Fruits,vegetabl.	3 154	619	5.0919	27.87%	132.5%	8.5%	6.4%
Other food	934	180	5.1981	28.45%	135.2%	2.5%	1.9%
Beverages	284	23	12.5472	68.67%	326.5%	0.8%	2.0%
Non-alc.	0	0	0.0000	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Alcoholic	267	21	12.7695	69.88%	332.2%	7.0%	0.2%
Tobacco	584	187	3.1253	17.10%	81.3%	1.6%	1.9%
Clothing,footw.	3 921	968	4.0495	22.16%	105.4%	10.6%	10.0%
Clothing	3 404	856	3.9775	21.77%	103.5%	9.2%	8.9%
Footwear	534	117	4.5687	25.00%	118.9%	1.4%	1.2%
Gross rents,fuel& power	4 739	835	5.6741	31.05%	147.5%	12.8%	8.6%
Gross rents	2 620	370	7.0801	38.75%	184.2%	7.1%	3.8%
Fuel and power	2 119	466	4.5497	24.90%	118.4%	5.7%	4.8%
House furnishings	1 418	252	5.6312	30.82%	146.5%	3.8%	2.6%
Furniture	67	12	5.4665	29.92%	142.2%	0.2%	0.1%
Household textiles	534	91	5.8715	32.13%	152.8%	1.4%	0.9%
Appliances	0	0	0.0000	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other househ.goods	818	148	5.5322	30.28%	143.9%	2.2%	1.5%
Medical care	884	191	4.6322	25.35%	120.5%	2.4%	2.0%
Pharmac.prod	801	163	4.9217	26.93%	128.1%	2.2%	1.7%
Health serv.	83	28	2.9870	16.35%	77.7%	0.2%	0.3%
Transport,comm.	417	86	4.8581	26.59%	126.4%	1.1%	0.9%
Transport equipm.	33	1	30.7011	168.01%	798.8%	0.1%	0.0%
Operation costs	33	3	10.0829	55.18%	262.3%	0.1%	0.0%
Purchased transp.serv.	334	79	4.2146	23.06%	109.7%	0.9%	0.8%
Communication	17	3	6.0728	33.23%	158.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Recreation,education	934	269	3.4773	19.03%	90.5%	2.5%	2.8%
Equipm.for recr.	50	2	22.6639	124.03%	589.7%	0.1%	0.0%
Recr. serv.	584	115	5.0674	27.73%	131.8%	1.6%	1.2%
Books,newspapers	50	7	7.1942	39.37%	187.2%	0.1%	0.1%
Education	250	145	1.7287	94.60%	45.0%	7.0%	1.5%
Misc.goods,serv.	1 435	443	3.2380	17.72%	84.3%	3.9%	4.6%
Restaurants,etc	868	266	3.2594	17.84%	84.8%	2.3%	2.8%
Net exp.of res.abroad	0	0	0.0000	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Government	3 171	1 523	2.0812	11.39%	54.2%	8.5%	15.8%
Consumption & Government	37 129	9 661	3.8433	21.03%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table B.2 Per capita total final consumption of Nepal, 1985

	In average ESCAP(11) prices, Asian dollars	Nepal's level in percentage of Average ESCAP(10) level	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philip-pines	Pakistan	Bangla-desh	India
Consumption	488	33.1%	6.8%	6.9%	15.5%	20.3%	27.6%	43.7%	34.8%	51.4%	75.1%	90.4%
Food, bev. and tob.	305	58.5%	20.8%	24.0%	25.6%	31.5%	42.3%	58.1%	36.8%	73.4%	80.4%	104.0%
Food	292	64.2%	26.4%	28.1%	25.4%	38.1%	47.0%	62.6%	38.6%	79.9%	82.7%	105.7%
Bread,cereals	209	149.0%	97.2%	149.7%	74.1%	64.3%	99.8%	111.3%	64.5%	182.4%	100.0%	247.3%
Meat	11	21.6%	8.2%	3.1%	3.7%	9.7%	12.0%	65.3%	10.7%	23.5%	31.5%	84.4%
Fish	2	4.1%	0.9%	1.1%	19.0%	3.3%	1.4%	2.8%	1.2%	5.6%	6.4%	18.5%
Milk,cheese	12	25.0%	14.1%	20.7%	8.9%	30.9%	48.1%	57.5%	28.7%	26.4%	97.2%	26.9%
Oils, fats	11	40.0%	41.2%	20.9%	19.2%	91.1%	85.6%	191.1%	75.3%	28.0%	86.0%	37.8%
Fruits,vegetabl.	37	46.1%	21.5%	21.3%	13.6%	23.6%	33.2%	33.7%	64.7%	84.6%	96.6%	64.3%
Other food	11	16.6%	3.9%	9.9%	10.4%	15.8%	25.9%	17.5%	17.7%	24.0%	56.0%	27.9%
Beverages	1	4.1%	0.6%	0.9%	23.1%	1.3%	1.9%	6.1%	4.2%	8.6%	301.0%	25.1%
Non-alc.	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Alcoholic	1	5.3%	0.8%	1.4%	0.0%	1.6%	3.1%	5.9%	6.6%	0.0%	500.0%	24.9%
Tobacco	11	34.6%	7.6%	13.8%	36.2%	12.3%	41.7%	31.3%	28.9%	33.2%	44.4%	100.7%
Clothing,footw.	58	51.3%	12.6%	7.9%	19.9%	32.5%	30.9%	58.3%	97.3%	69.5%	117.0%	117.5%
Clothing	51	50.8%	12.5%	8.1%	21.8%	34.9%	28.1%	60.9%	119.5%	66.6%	112.8%	112.1%
Footwear	7	57.8%	14.1%	7.1%	12.4%	22.3%	120.3%	45.5%	42.0%	108.3%	169.5%	204.2%
Gross rents,fuel & power	50	22.1%	3.9%	9.7%	7.5%	25.0%	41.2%	110.2%	31.8%	45.1%	46.1%	69.3%
Gross rents	22	12.6%	2.0%	5.4%	4.7%	19.2%	32.9%	143.3%	24.9%	42.1%	32.7%	39.5%
Fuel and power	28	56.0%	15.4%	26.7%	14.3%	32.9%	51.6%	93.3%	40.8%	47.9%	68.6%	173.2%
House furnishings	15	22.6%	3.9%	3.2%	10.4%	11.1%	15.6%	27.7%	27.1%	48.9%	85.6%	106.9%
Furniture	1	9.0%	2.8%	0.7%	2.2%	5.8%	2.2%	5.1%	19.8%	15.4%	13.0%	35.6%
Household textiles	5	68.7%	11.1%	52.7%	18.0%	13.1%	174.5%	637.1%	538.9%	76.4%	0.0%	0.0%
Appliances	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other househ.goods	9	26.4%	4.7%	3.8%	18.6%	15.0%	15.7%	24.1%	22.0%	139.9%	123.2%	88.4%
Medical care	11	11.9%	1.6%	3.5%	6.3%	12.5%	11.6%	26.9%	47.8%	46.8%	120.3%	65.7%
Pharmac.prod	10	55.6%	23.2%	14.7%	17.2%	51.8%	13.0%	63.0%	93.3%	314.9%	1714.6%	85.3%
Health serv.	2	2.1%	0.2%	0.6%	1.3%	2.3%	7.1%	6.2%	12.4%	7.9%	18.7%	26.9%
Transport,comm.	5	4.2%	0.8%	0.9%	1.8%	2.4%	2.3%	3.2%	21.2%	4.6%	13.4%	14.0%
Transport equipm.	0	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.8%	0.7%	0.4%	50.5%	7.9%
Operation costs	0	0.6%	0.1%	0.3%	0.2%	1.0%	0.5%	1.5%	2.1%	0.4%	4.7%	3.0%
Purchased transp.serv.	5	8.0%	2.9%	1.0%	2.9%	3.1%	2.8%	3.5%	156.2%	10.7%	13.9%	17.1%
Communication	0	1.8%	0.3%	0.3%	1.1%	0.5%	4.2%	2.1%	6.0%	12.2%	0.0%	11.3%
Recreation,education	16	9.9%	1.5%	1.2%	11.7%	5.3%	8.6%	12.6%	13.7%	22.2%	58.1%	41.1%
Equipm.for recr.	0	0.5%	0.1%	0.0%	1.6%	0.2%	0.8%	3.4%	18.6%	1.7%	29.7%	12.5%
Recr. serv.	7	16.7%	2.3%	1.5%	134.2%	14.5%	46.9%	16.4%	73.9%	15.8%	96.0%	104.4%
Books,newspapers	0	4.8%	0.6%	0.7%	12.6%	4.5%	3.9%	7.2%	12.5%	33.2%	134.7%	38.8%
Education	9	10.1%	1.9%	3.6%	7.2%	4.5%	6.0%	11.4%	8.4%	44.9%	43.9%	28.4%
Misc.goods,serv.	27	16.1%	2.5%	1.3%	10.3%	8.1%	13.2%	59.2%	19.8%	26.9%	133.4%	128.5%
Restaurants,etc	16	24.0%	3.2%	2.2%	17.0%	19.1%	16.8%	159.8%	29.2%	73.8%	2708.5%	378.1%
Net exp.of res.abroad	0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Government	91	55.9%	25.6%	27.6%	26.3%	36.5%	20.5%	35.3%	40.1%	30.2%	67.8%	122.4%
Consumption & Government	576	35.3%	7.7%	7.8%	16.5%	21.8%	26.2%	42.1%	35.5%	46.3%	73.9%	94.3%

Table B.3 Per capita consumption of 11 ESCAP countries and areas at average prices of all countries/areas in Asian dollars, 1985

	Japan	Hong Kong	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	Republic of Korea	Thailand	Sri Lanka	Philippines	Pakistan	Bangladesh	India	Nepal
Consumption	7 097	7 081	3 211	2 440	1 820	1 160	1 448	989	680	572	489
Food, bev. and tob.	1 499	1 309	1 234	1 006	756	555	870	447	405	318	305
Food	1 136	1 076	1 197	806	655	495	798	393	377	300	292
Bread,cer.	222	145	289	345	224	202	346	125	224	93	209
Meat	134	352	303	114	93	17	104	48	35	13	11
Fish	200	165	10	57	135	67	161	34	29	10	2
Milk,cheese	89	60	138	41	26	22	44	48	13	48	12
Oils, fats	30	59	65	14	15	6	16	44	14	33	11
Fruits,vegetabl.	180	183	281	164	119	116	61	43	41	61	37
Other food	280	111	111	71	43	64	65	49	20	42	11
Beverages	215	149	6	108	74	23	33	17	0	6	1
Non-alc.	55	62	6	28	32	1	14	17	0	0	0
Alcoholic	160	87	0	79	41	22	19	0	0	5	1
Tobacco	149	84	32	92	27	38	40	36	28	12	11
Clothing,footw.	465	745	300	182	196	108	60	90	51	54	58
Clothing	414	643	242	149	190	92	43	84	46	50	51
Footwear	51	102	58	32	6	16	17	7	4	4	7
Gross rents,fuel& power	1 299	515	677	205	125	47	160	115	112	73	50
Gross rents	1 117	411	177	117	68	15	89	53	68	56	22
Fuel and power	181	104	200	88	58	32	70	62	45	17	28
House furnishings	385	480	147	137	99	55	58	31	18	14	15
Furniture	26	107	34	13	33	15	4	5	6	2	1
Household textiles	48	10	29	40	3	1	1	7	2	0	5
Appliances	124	131	34	23	5	3	11	13	3	2	0
Other househ.goods	187	233	49	61	58	37	42	7	7	10	9
Medical care	691	322	181	90	103	43	24	24	9	18	11
Pharmac.prod	44	69	59	20	49	16	11	3	1	12	10
Health serv.	646	255	122	70	23	27	13	20	9	6	2
Transport,comm.	625	601	283	218	230	162	25	113	39	38	5
Transport equipm.	168	26	5	6	6	4	9	19	0	1	0
Operation costs	225	75	96	20	42	14	10	48	4	7	0
Purchased transp.serv.	167	453	166	157	178	137	3	44	35	29	5
Communication	64	47	15	35	4	8	3	1	0	1	0
Recreation,education	1 020	1 270	137	298	186	128	117	72	28	40	16
Equipm.for recr.	215	525	8	53	16	4	1	8	0	1	0
Recr. serv.	300	444	5	48	15	42	9	43	7	7	7
Books,newspapers	69	60	3	9	10	6	3	1	0	1	0
Education	436	241	121	189	145	77	104	19	20	31	9
Misc.goods,serv.	1 055	2 003	252	318	197	45	133	97	20	21	27
Restaurants,etc	486	721	91	81	92	10	55	21	1	4	16
Net exp.of res.abroad	59	-167	0	-15	-72	17	0	0	-2	-3	0
Government	361	337	3 444	257	459	267	235	312	137	78	91
Consumption & Government	7 458	7 418	3 568	2 697	2 279	1 427	1 682	1301	819	650	579

Annex C.

Table C.1. Population, area, GDP and consumption of 11 ESCAP countries and areas

	In absolute figures				*In percentage distribution*			
	Mid-year population (Millions)	*Area (Thousands of sq.km.)*	*GDP (Billions Asian dollars)*	*Global consump-tion (Billions Asian dollars)*	*Mid-year popula-tion*	*Area*	*GDP*	*Consumption*
Japan	120.75	377.8	1 425.3	903.7	9.3	5.1	49.1	42.6
Hong Kong	5.46	1.0	55.6	40.4	0.4	0.0	1.9	1.9
Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	47.82	1 648.0	220.5	167.4	3.7	22.3	7.6	7.9
Republic of Korea	41.21	99.0	163.7	109.5	3.2	1.3	5.6	5.2
Thailand	51.30	513.1	135.2	113.4	3.9	7.0	4.7	5.4
Sri Lanka	15.84	65.6	29.3	21.8	1.2	0.9	1.0	1.0
Philippines	54.67	300.0	97.8	89.0	4.2	4.1	3.4	4.2
Pakistan	97.67	796.1	130.8	122.2	7.5	10.8	4.5	5.8
Bangladesh	98.66	144.0	81.8	77.3	7.5	2.0	2.8	3.6
India	755.00	287.6	564.9	463.7	57.8	44.6	19.4	21.9
Nepal	16.69	140.8		9.7[a]	1.3	1.9		0.5
Total	1 305.07	7 373.0	2 904.9[b]	2 118.1	100.0	100.0	100.0[b]	100.0

[a] Valued at average prices of 11 Asian prices

[b] Excluding Nepal

Table D.1 List of ESCAP basic headings
(breakdown of GDP)

111011	Rice
111012	Flour, other cereals
111013	Bread
111014	Other bakery product
111015	Cereal preparations
111016	Other cereal product
111021	Fresh beef and veal
111022	Fresh lamb and mutton
111023	Fresh pork
111024	Fresh poultry
111025	Other fresh meat
111026	Dried or processed meat
111031	Fresh or frozen fish
111032	Seafood
111033	Smoked or preserved fish
111034	Canned fish, seafood
111041	Fresh milk
111042	Preserved milk
111043	Cheese
111044	Other milk products
111045	Eggs
111051	Butter
111052	Margarine, edible oils, lard and other fats
111061	Fresh fruits, tropical
111062	Other fresh fruits
111063	Dried or frozen or preserved fruit
111071	Fresh vegetables
111072	Dried or frozen and preserved vegetables
111081	Potatoes (English)
111082	Manioc and other tubers
111091	Sugar
111101	Coffee
111102	Tea

Table D.1 *(continued)*

111103	Cocoa
111111	Jam, preserves and the like
111112	Sugar products and chocolate
111113	Salt, spice and sauces
112011	Mineral water
112012	Soft drinks
112021	Spirits
112022	Wine and cider
112023	Beer
113011	Cigarettes
113021	Other tobacco products
121011	Clothing materials
121021	Men's clothing
121022	Women's clothing
121023	Children's clothing
121031	Clothing accessories
121041	Clothing - rent, repair
122011	Men's footwear
122012	Women's footwear
122013	Children's footwear
122021	Repairs to footwear
131011	Gross rents
131021	Indoor repair - materials
131022	Indoor repair - labour
131031	Sanitary services and water charges
132011	Electricity
132012	Gas (incl. liquefied gas)
132013	Liquid fuels
132014	Other fuels
141011	Furniture and fixtures
141012	Floor coverings
141013	Repairs to furniture
142011	Household textiles, etc.
143011	Refrigerators, freezers and similar appliances
143021	Washing and cleaning appliances

Table D.1 *(continued)*

143031	Cooking and other warming appliances
143041	Air-conditioner, etc.
143051	Other household appliances
143061	Repair to major household appliances
144011	Glassware, utensils
145011	Paper products for household
145012	House cleaning supplies
145013	Other non-durable household products
145021	Domestic services
145031	Household services
151011	Drugs and medical preparations
151021	Medical supplies
152011	Therapeutic appliances and equipment
153011 G	Services of physician (Govt.)
153011 P	Services of physician (Private)
153021 G	Services of dentist (Govt.)
153021 P	Services of dentist (Private)
153031	Other medical services
154011 G	Hospital services (Govt.)
154011 P	Hospital services (Private)
161011	Passenger cars
161021	Other transport equipment
162011	Tyres, tubes, and other parts and accessories
162021	Repair to transport equipment
162031	Fuel and lubricants
162041	Other expenditure for transport equipment
163011	Local taxis
163012	Local buses, trams and similar transport
163013	Other local transport
163021	Railway transport
163022	Road transport (long distances)
163023	Air transport
163024	Other long distance transport
164011	Postal services
164021	Telephone charges

Table D.1 *(continued)*

164022	Telegraph charges
171011	Radio, TV sets, etc.
171021	Photographic, cinematographic equipment
171031	Other recreational durables
171041	Semi- and non-durable recreational goods
171051	Repairs to equipment
172011	Cinema, theater, sport grounds, etc.
172021	Other entertainment services
173011	Books, newspapers and magazines etc.
174011	Primary education
174012 G	Secondary education (Govt.)
174012 P	Secondary education (Private)
174013 G	Tertiary education (Govt.)
174013 P	Tertiary education (Private)
181011	Services of barber and beauty shops etc.
182011	Toilet articles and preparations
182021	Personal effects
182031	Stationery
183011	Restaurants and cafes
183012	Workers' cafes
183021	Hotels and lodgings
184011	Financial services
184021	Services n.e.c.
184031	Welfare services
191011	Residents purchases abroad
191012	Non-resident purchases
211011	Compensation of employees
211012	Net purchase of goods and services
211013	Consumption of fixed capital
311011	Residential buildings
312011	Industrial buildings
312021	Commercial buildings
312031	Education buildings
312041	Health buildings
312051	Agricultural buildings

Table D.1 *(continued)*

312061	Other buildings
313011	Other construction
314011	Land improvement, etc.
315011	Railway vehicles
315021	Motor vehicles
315031	Aircraft
315041	Ships and boats
315051	Other transport equipment
316011	Engines and turbines
317011	Agricultural machinery
318011	Office machines and equipment
319011	Metal, woodworking, paper and printing machinery
320011	Construction and mining equipment
321011	Food machinery
322011	Textile and leather working machinery
323011	Chemical machinery
324011	General industry machinery
325011	Service industry machinery
326011	Electric generation, transmission, distribution and industrial apparatus
326021	Radio, TV, and other communication equipment
326031	Other electric apparatus
327011	Furniture and Fixtures
328011	Other producer durable goods
331011	Changes in stocks
411011	Net foreign balance