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Executive Summary

1. Introduction

1.1. Context and Issues: Financing the post-2015 development agenda remains one of the major concerns underpinning the ongoing discussions on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This is particularly relevant in the context of Goal 17, as mentioned in the outcome document of the UN Open Working Group (OWG) on SDGs which is dedicated to 'Means of Implementation (MoI)' and 'Global Partnership'. As may be recalled, the Third Financing for Development (FfD) Conference is going to be held in Addis Ababa on 13-16 July, 2015. As part of the preparatory process of the Conference, the United Nations has prepared three reference documents – Elements Paper for the Third Financing for Development Conference, Zero Draft of the Addis Ababa Accord and Revised Draft of the Addis Ababa Accord. These three documents have outlined a diverse range of modalities to underwrite financing for development. There is an opportunity now to situate this discourse in relation to the discussion on Goal 17 of the SDGs.

1.2. Objectives of the Paper: The objective of the current paper is to examine and explore concepts and practical aspects of the financing for development initiative in the Asian context. Asian countries are diverse on their own accord – there is a spectrum of low-income countries including the least developed countries (LDCs), two large emerging economies (India and China) and a number of middle-income countries. Indeed, Asia also has a number of OECD members such as Japan and South Korea. Asian countries also differ in terms of history, demographics and culture. Accordingly, there is a notable heterogeneity amongst the Asian countries. However, the current paper focuses particularly on countries of South and South-East Asia from the perspective of finance for development. The paper flags demands, determinants and doable actions in the context of financing the post-2015 development agenda with an aim to capture the regional perspectives within a frame of global partnership.

1.3. Layout of the Paper: To focus on the issue of financing for sustainable development, it is important to make a distinction between financial strengths and weaknesses of the economies along with the trends of financial flows in these economies. Following introduction, Section 2 reviews the financial landscape in Asia; Section 3 revisits the trade landscape in Asia; Section 4 provides a comparative analysis on financial flows from intra-regional and inter-regional context. Section 5 outlines comments on the Addis Accord from the Asian perspective. Finally, Section 6 concludes the discussion with some observations.
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2. Financial Landscape in Asia

An attempt has been made in this section to review and analyse the trends in different financial flows in South Asia and South-East Asia covering the period of 2000 to 2013. Several financing modalities have been considered here; viz. domestic public finance, domestic and international private business and finance, international public finance and international trade which follows the structure outlined in the zero draft of the Addis Accord.

2.1. Domestic Public Finance: The aggregate trends concerning tax mobilisation, i.e. trends in tax revenue as percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) evince that this share has increased for majority of the South Asian countries. The trend shows an upward trend for Bangladesh, India, Maldives and Nepal for the period of 2000-2012. However, it declined in Sri Lanka from 14.5 per cent in 2000 to 12 per cent in 2013. Over the comparable period, the share of tax revenue in South Asia had increased by 1.6 per cent (from 9 per cent in 2000 to 10.6 per cent in 2012). However, the situation is different for South-East Asia. Over the period of 2000 to 2012 it had come down in three South-East Asian countries – Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. However, for Malaysia, the comparable figures had gone up from 13.7 per cent of GDP in 2000 to 16.1 per cent of GDP in 2012. Between 2000-2012, tax-GDP ratio declined by 3.4 per cent in South-East Asia. Indeed, this dismal situation as regards mobilisation of tax revenues and the limited success in mobilising domestic resources in Asia have been observed in a number of studies (see, Gupta, 2015 and Park, 2012).

To assess the performance of the selected countries in terms of their revenue collection, it is important to analyse not only the aggregate level data, but also the composition of the revenue intake. To analyse the structure of the collected taxes in South Asia and South-East Asia, two types of taxation have been considered: (i) taxes on income, profits and capital gains and (ii) taxes on international trade.

The share of direct tax (as percentage of GDP) has increased from 2.8 per cent in 2000 to 4.6 per cent in 2012 in South Asia. A rising trend has been noted for Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. However, tax on income, profit and capital gains (as percentage of GDP) fell from 8.2 per cent in 2000 to 7.5 per cent in 2012 for countries of South-East Asia. However, at the country level, the share experienced an upward trend in Cambodia, Malaysia, Philippines and Vietnam. On the contrary, over the comparable period, Singapore witnessed a decline in taxes on income, profit and capital gains. Over the comparable period (2000-2012), overall direct tax collection has increased in South Asia, while it has declined in South-East Asia.

As the data indicates, as percentage of GDP, tax on international trade is rather low for South Asian countries. Within the region, it is the highest in Maldives and lowest in Bhutan. The ratio had increased for Sri Lanka while it declined in Bangladesh, India and Pakistan over the period of 2000-2012. In South-East Asian countries, tax on international trade (as percentage of GDP) is lower than the South Asian region. Tax on international trade declined from 2000 to 2012 in both South Asia and South-East Asia.

2.2. Domestic and International Private Business and Finance: The share of private investment in GDP has increased notably, by 4.6 per cent, in South Asia, between 2000 and 2013. The private investment-GDP ratio is highest in Bhutan and has remained more than 30 per cent
over the period of 2000 to 2013. Private investment (as percentage of GDP) shows an increasing trend for Bangladesh, India and Nepal over the comparable period. However, it experienced declining trend for Pakistan and Sri Lanka. In South-East Asia, private investment (as percentage of GDP) surged by 10.4 per cent from 2000 to 2013. It shows a rising trend for Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand over the corresponding period. However, for Cambodia this indicator has experienced a declining trend. The increasing share of private investment in both South Asia and South-East Asia clearly indicates an upsurge in private sector activities in both the regions.

**Foreign Direct Investment (FDI)** inflow in South Asian countries is very low as percentage of GDP. Except for Maldives, FDI as percentage of GDP is lower than 2 per cent for all the South Asian countries. In the South-East Asian region, all countries had FDI inflows of more than 2 per cent of GDP equivalent, except for Indonesia and Philippines. From 2000 to 2013, the share has increased in all South-East Asian economies except in Indonesia and Philippines. The FDI-GDP ratio rose steadily from 4.1 per cent in 2000 to 5.2 per cent in 2013 in South-East Asia. The contrasting picture as regards the FDI inflows to these two regions has been adequately captured by a number of studies (see, Gould et al., 2013; Sjohlom, 2013). Studies confirm that overall trade restrictiveness and weak institutions that fail to protect interests of foreign investors and facilitate investments are at the core of low FDI flow to countries in South Asia.

**Remittance inflow** as percentage of GDP is highest for Nepal compared to other South Asian countries. Over the period of 2000 to 2013, this share showed an upward trend for Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. For South Asia, the ratio has increased by 1.9 per cent over the comparable period. On the contrary, the share declined by 0.1 per cent for countries in South-East Asia. In South-East Asia region, Philippines had the highest remittance-GDP ratio. Studies confirmed that, remittance is the major source of capital inflows for Asian economies, particularly for South Asia. It is to be noted that, workers’ remittances are the most stable variable component when compared to other types of capital flows, followed by trade flows and FDI flows for the South Asian Countries (Gopalan & Rajan, 2009).

2.3. **International Public Finance-ODA:** Net official development assistance (ODA) received by South Asia (as percentage of GDP) has continued to remain at below one per cent and appears to have remained stagnant over the period of 2000 to 2013. Over the comparable period, the share has declined in all South Asian countries except Pakistan. The share fell in all South-East Asian countries.

3. **Trade Landscape in Asia**

Over the period of 2000 to 2013, export as percentage of GDP rose in Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Maldives. On the contrary, it fell in Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka over the comparable period. For South Asia, the share fell by 9.2 per cent over the same period. In South-East Asia region, it demonstrated an increasing trend for Cambodia, Lao PDR, Singapore, Thailand and

---

3 Tapering programme of the bond purchase by the US and the election uncertainty led to lower net inflows of FDI in Indonesia in recent times (CEIC, 2015). Philippines has seen reductions in FDI inflows after the Asian crisis due to the vestiges of protection which do not jibe with the contemporary rationale for FDI (Alburo, n.d.).
Vietnam, while it showed a downward trend for Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar and Philippines. For South-East Asia as a whole, the indicator declined by 17.5 per cent over the same period.

Intra-regional export in South Asia continues to remain very low at about 4-6 per cent for the period 2001 to 2013. Among the South Asian countries, Bangladesh’s intra-regional export is the lowest with Nepal being the highest. Intra-regional export in South-East Asia is much higher compared to the intra-regional export in South Asia. In South-East Asia region it is highest for Singapore and lowest for Cambodia.

4. Financial Flows in Asia in a Comparative Perspective

This section of the paper highlights a comparative scenario of financial flows in Asia. More specifically, firstly the section examines the relative performance of the two regions of Asia, viz. South Asia and South-East Asia; this is followed by a comparative analysis of financial flows in the regions of Asia and Africa.4

4.1. Intra-Regional Comparison

4.1.1. Domestic Public Finance: Tax revenue as percentage of GDP is higher in South-East Asia compared to South Asia. The share of direct tax fell in South-East Asia while it rose in South Asia over the comparable period. Tax on international trade has fallen over the comparable period in both the regions.

4.1.2. Domestic and International Private Business and Finance: Private investment could be a potential source of finance in both the regions. Currently, in both the regions the share of private investment to GDP stands at more than 20 per cent.

FDI (as percentage of GDP) increased over time from 2000 to 2013 in both South Asia and South-East Asia. However, FDI can turn out to be a prospective source of financing development in coming years for South-East Asia region.

Remittance inflow demonstrated a rising trend in South Asia while it fell somewhat in South-East Asia over the period between 2000 and 2013. Indeed, in recent times, remittance inflow has emerged as a highly potential source of mobilising resources.

4.1.3. International Public Finance-ODA: From the point of view of lowering dependency on ODA, both South Asia and South-East Asia have achieved notable progress.

4.1.4. International Trade: South-East Asia has outperformed South Asia in terms of export. The share of export in GDP in South-East Asia is higher than that of South Asia over the period of 2000 to 2013. South-East Asia is more integrated than South Asia region in terms of export as intra-regional export in South-East Asia is higher than that of South Asia.

4 For South Asia, countries included – Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. For South-East Asia, countries included – Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. 48 Sub-Saharan African countries were selected as representing Africa.
4.2. Inter-Regional Comparison

4.2.1. Domestic Public Finance: Tax revenue as percentage of GDP has fallen in both Asia and Africa from 2000 to 2012. However, tax revenue as percentage of GDP has been historically high in Africa when juxtaposed to the tax effort in Asia. From 2000-2012, direct tax had increased in both regions – Asia and Africa. On the contrary, tax on international trade fell in both the regions over comparable period.

4.2.2. Domestic and International Private Business and Finance: Private investment (as percentage of GDP) has increased over time in both Asia and Africa region from 2000 to 2013. However, this increased at a significantly higher pace in Asia than Africa. FDI inflow (as percentage of GDP) has declined in Asia over the period of 2000 to 2013, while it has increased in Africa. However, the share of FDI in GDP was approximately double in Asia region when compared to that of Africa region. Asia has been progressing exceptionally well in tapping financial flows from remittances. Remittance inflow as percentage of GDP was much higher in Asia than Africa.

4.2.3. International Public Finance-ODA: In contrast to Africa, Asia is less dependent on ODA. Net ODA (as percentage of GDP) received by Asia fell from 0.8 per cent in 2000 to 0.5 per cent in 2012. For Africa, it declined from 3.6 per cent to 3.0 per cent over the comparable period.

4.2.4. International Trade: Asia is well ahead of Africa in terms of export. Trade could be an important means of implementation for the Asia region. Though, intra-regional trade has increased in both Asia and Africa, data indicates that Asia is more integrated than Africa region.

5. Comments on Addis Accord from Asian Perspective
This section reviews the financing issues reflected in three documents associated with the Third FfD – Elements Paper (UN 2015a), Zero Draft (UN 2015b) and Revised Draft of Addis Accord (UN 2015c). This section also consults the outcome document of Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation in this regard.

5.1. Domestic Public Finance: Zero Draft of the Addis Accord reiterates the commitment of strengthening the mobilisation and effective use of domestic resources in support of national sustainable development strategies. To enhance tax revenue, countries with government revenue below 20 per cent of GDP were to set a target of halving the gap towards 20 per cent by 2025. This is highly relevant for South Asia and South-East Asia; indeed, tax-GDP ratio of both the regions is below 15 per cent. In this connection, the draft Addis Accord emphasised on the need to strengthen revenue administration through modernised, progressive tax systems, improved tax policy capacity and more efficient tax collection. The document also called for improving fairness, transparency and effectiveness concerning the tax systems. Additionally, to combat illicit financial flows (IFFs), tax evasion and corruption, the document calls for strengthening national regulations and international cooperation. In this connection, several international initiatives have been mentioned, such as the Global Forum on Transparency and Exchange of Information for Tax purposes, UN Convention against Corruption, Stolen Asset Recovery initiative of the United Nations and the World Bank.
Busan outcome document also emphasised on taking actions to facilitate domestic resource mobilisation. In addition, it also stressed the need for acceleration of efforts at individual country level to combat IFF by strengthening anti-money laundering measures, addressing tax evasion, and strengthening national and international policies.

5.2. **Domestic and International Private Business and Finance**: Domestic private investment (as percentage of GDP) has increased over time in Asia region. Zero Draft of Addis Accord acknowledges the role of domestic private business activity as a major driver of economic growth and reaffirmed that private finance is larger than all public finance combined. In this context, public policy plays a key role in creating the enabling environment to encourage entrepreneurship and stimulate the domestic business sector.

Flow of FDI has been historically low in Asia. Revised draft of Addis Accord commits to strengthen insurance and investment guarantees to increase FDI inflows.

Remittances inflow is another potential source of financing development in Asia. The Zero Draft of the FFD also acknowledges the significance of remittances from overseas as a financial resource for households in many countries. The document emphasised that to enhance their impact on development, countries should integrate remittances into their national financial inclusion strategies. In addition, it recommends to reduce the cost of migrant remittances to less than 3 per cent. Moreover, it sets a target that no remittance corridors should require charges higher than 5 per cent by 2030.

Busan outcome document urged countries to ensure a sound policy and regulatory environment towards accelerated private sector development and increased foreign direct investment.

5.3. **International Public Finance (ODA)**: The dependency of Asia region on ODA is comparatively lower than that of Africa. However, ODA remains critically important for countries that have limited capacity to raise public resources domestically. The Zero Draft urges that all developed countries that have not yet done so to significantly increase their ODA, starting immediately, with a view to implementing by 2020 their commitment to allocate 0.7 per cent of the gross national income (GNI) as ODA to developing countries, with 0.15-0.2 per cent of GNI to be allocated to the LDCs. In furtherance, the Revised Draft encourages the targeting of ODA to countries where the need is greatest, in particular the LDCs, LLDCs, SIDS and African countries, in accordance with their national priorities. The document urged all developed countries to allocate at least 50 per cent of net ODA to the LDCs.

Busan outcome documents urged to improve the quality, consistency and transparency of reporting on the tying status of aid. It also emphasised on establishing transparent public financial management and aid information management systems in this regard.

5.4. **International Trade**: The Zero Draft of Addis Accord expressed concerns over the low participation of the LDCs in world trade. Out of 17 selected countries of Asia, seven are LDCs. In this connection, the document reaffirmed the commitment to strengthen the multilateral system and calls on WTO members to fully and expeditiously implement the Bali Package, including the decisions taken in favour of LDCs. It also calls for the full and effective implementation of decisions regarding duty-free quota-free market access, for products originating from the LDCs,
consistent with the Hong Kong Ministerial Declaration adopted by the WTO in 2005, and the
Bali decision in 2013 on duty-free quota-free access.

The Zero Draft also recognises the significance of regional economic integration to promote
growth and sustainable development. The document commits countries to strengthen regional
cooperation and regional trade agreements. As will be recalled, the Trans-Pacific Partnership
(TPP) is a proposed regional free trade agreement (FTA) which involves four South-East Asian
countries, Brunei, Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam. The TPP could significantly impact on
global trade dynamics, given the high volume of intra-TPP trade and the regulatory mechanisms
that are being discussed. Other notable regional agreements that merit mention are Association
of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) FTA, South Asian Free Trade Agreement (SAFTA), and Bay
of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC). The
Zero Draft of Addis Accord also urges the international community to increase its support to
projects that foster regional integration. To address gaps in trade and transport-related regional
infrastructure, it further calls on regional and multilateral development banks, in collaboration
with other stakeholders, to come up with adequate resources.

The Zero Draft also calls for an increase in aid for trade to developing countries, in particular to
the LDCs. To be specific, the Revised Draft of FiD outlines the role of the Enhanced Integrated
Framework (EIF) for trade-related technical assistance to the LDCs. It may be recalled that the
Busan outcome document had also stressed the importance of aid for trade as an engine for
sustainable development.

5.5. **Systemic Issues:** The draft document on Addis Accord has mentioned about several
systemic issues. Some of the issues which are relevant in the context of Asian economies are the
followings:

- Asian economies had been hit hard by the sharp drop in demand in the developed
economies due to the global financial crisis in 2008 (Kawai, 2009). The Zero Draft in this
regard underscored the need for sound regulations governing the financial markets. In
addition, it urges to strengthen international coordination and coherence as regards
macroeconomic policies to enhance global financial and macroeconomic stability.
- The document also recognises the importance of strengthening the international financial
safety net. Further, it reiterates the commitment to maintain a strong and quota-based IMF,
with adequate resources to fulfil its systemic responsibilities.
- To improve global governance for sustainable development, the Zero Draft urges to take
measures for a stronger, more coherent and more inclusive international architecture.
- The Zero Draft reiterates the urgency of broadening and strengthening the participation of
developing and transition economy countries in international economic decision making.
- The document invites the IMF to consider regular periodic allocations of special drawing
rights (SDRs) to supplement IMF member countries’ foreign reserves.
- The draft Addis Accord highlights the efforts for protecting the rights of migrant workers in
compliance with the ILO’s fundamental convention and rights of displaced persons.
- The Zero Draft urges to strengthen coherence and consistency of multilateral financial,
investment, trade, and development policy and environment institutions and platforms.
- To reduce volatility in food commodity and derivative markets, the draft calls on regulatory
bodies to adopt measures to reduce excess volatility.
The Busan outcome document also mentioned about the need for a new architecture for development cooperation. It specially mentioned about South-South and triangular cooperation and new forms of public-private partnership in this regard. The document also underscored the importance of improving the coherence of policies regarding multilateral institutions, global funds and programmes.

5.6. Data Issues: To ensure greater transparency in the conduct of monitoring of development, the Zero Draft emphasises on improving the availability of appropriately disaggregated financing data and also other means of implementation. In this regard, the document calls on relevant international financial institutions to strengthen and standardise data on domestic resource mobilisation and other streams of finance.

6. Conclusion

Tax revenue as percentage of GDP is higher in South-East Asia than South Asia. Tax on international trade has fallen over the comparable period in both regions. To enhance domestic revenue mobilisation, Asian countries should put more emphasis on modernised, progressive tax systems, improved tax policy capacity and more efficient tax collection. They also need to significantly improve fairness, transparency and effectiveness of the tax systems.

FDI could turn out to be highly potential source of financing for development in the coming years in the context of South-East Asia region. Public policy could play a key role in creating the enabling environment to encourage domestic and foreign investment.

In contrast to Africa, Asia is less dependent on ODA. However, ODA remains critically important for countries that have limited capacity to raise public resources domestically. All developed countries should increase their ODA significantly, starting immediately, with a view to implementing by 2020 their commitment to allocate 0.7 per cent of GNI as ODA to the developing countries, with 0.15-0.20 per cent of GNI to be earmarked for the LDCs.

Asia is well ahead of Africa in terms of export. Trade could be a potential means of implementation for the Asia region. Nevertheless, regional integration in Asia is much higher than Africa. Several measures, such as effective implementation of the Bali Package, strengthening regional cooperation and regional trade agreements and promoting more Aid for Trade (AfT) could play a critically important role in this regard.

At the regional level, Africa has institutional platform to coordinate the efforts regarding financing and implementation of sustainable development goals. In April 2014, African thinkers, Parliamentarians, civil society organisations (CSOs) had gathered in Ghana to develop a shared narrative of post-2015 development in the African context. Also, Heads of States and Governments of the African Union had assembled in Ethiopia in January 2014 to discuss the Common African Position (CAP) on the post-2015 Development Agenda. The process involved stakeholders at the national, regional and continental levels from among the public and private sectors, parliamentarians, CSOs. However, at the regional level, Asia has no institutional or political platform to ensure coordination of the various efforts in connection with financing of the sustainable development agendas. In this backdrop, a united regional approach on the part of Asian countries is urgently needed to harmonise the ongoing efforts in financing for development.
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Annex Table 1: Financial Landscape in Asia
(as percentage of GDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Domestic Public Finance</th>
<th>Domestic and International Private Business and Finance</th>
<th>International Public Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Revenue</td>
<td>Tax on Income, Profits and Capital Gains</td>
<td>Tax on International Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ estimation based on WDI database.\(^5\)
Note: Data for all variables cover the period of 2000-2013.

---

### Annex Table 2: Trade Landscape in Asia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Export (as percentage of GDP)</th>
<th>Trade (as percentage of total export)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ estimation based on UNCTAD database. ⁶

Note: Data for export covers the period of 2000-2013 while data for intra-regional export covers the period of 2001-2013.

---

### Annex Table 3: Intra-Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Domestic Public Finance</th>
<th>Domestic and International Private Business and Finance</th>
<th>International Public Finance</th>
<th>Trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Revenue (as % of GDP)</td>
<td>Tax on Income, Profits and Capital Gains (as % of GDP)</td>
<td>Tax on International Trade (as % of GDP)</td>
<td>Private Investment (as % of GDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia excluding India</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Asia</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' estimation based on WDI and UNCTAD database.7

Note: Data for all variables (except intra-regional export) cover period of 2000-2013 while data for intra-regional export covers period of 2001-2013.

### Annex Table 4: Inter-Regional Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Domestic Public Finance</th>
<th>Domestic and International Private Business and Finance</th>
<th>International Public Finance</th>
<th>International Trade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Revenue (as % of GDP)</td>
<td>Tax on Income, Profits and Capital Gains (as % of GDP)</td>
<td>Tax on International Trade (as % of GDP)</td>
<td>Private Investment (as % of GDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors' estimation based on WDI and UNCTAD database.8

Note: Data for all variables (except intra-regional export) cover period of 2000-2013 while data for intra-regional export covers period of 2001-2013.
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