



A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF TWO GLOBAL POWER BLOCS

Sector Commentary

September 2025



Two Blocs, Two Worldviews

The contemporary international system is increasingly defined by the dynamic tension between two principal groupings: the Group of Seven (G7) and the BRICS+ bloc. These are not merely economic clubs but represent fundamentally different visions for the future of global governance. Their contrasting origins, compositions, and objectives are shaping the contours of a new era of geopolitical competition.

The Group of Seven (G7)

The G7 is best understood not simply as a collection of wealthy nations, but as the political and economic core of the Western-led liberal international order established in the aftermath of the Second World War. Its membership (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States, with the European Union as a permanent guest) is bound by a shared philosophy rooted in liberal democracy, pluralism, representative government, and free-market capitalism.

Functionally, the G7 operates as an informal steering committee for this order. It lacks a formal charter or secretariat, a design choice that facilitates flexible and high-level coordination. Its primary *modus operandi* is to build consensus among its members on pressing global issues and then leverage their collective financial and political weight to guide the actions of formal international institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization (WTO). The G7's approach to global governance is therefore fundamentally status-quo oriented. Its historical evolution shows a consistent pattern of adapting the existing system to new challenges (from the oil shocks of the 1970s to modern threats like terrorism, climate change, and pandemics) while seeking to preserve the system's core principles and its members' leading role within it.

BRICS+

In stark contrast, the expanded BRICS+ bloc has emerged as a revisionist coalition, challenging the political, economic, and ideological architecture of the G7-led order. Its diverse membership (originally Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, and now expanded to include Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, the United Arab Emirates, and Indonesia) is united less by a shared internal political system and more by a common grievance against what it perceives as Western dominance in global institutions.

The core philosophy of BRICS+ is the promotion of a "multipolar" world order. This vision emphasises the principles of state sovereignty, non-intervention in internal affairs, and a more equitable distribution of power that reflects the growing economic weight of emerging nations. For many of its members, this perspective is informed by a post-colonial worldview and a desire for greater strategic autonomy on the world stage. Consequently, the BRICS+ approach to global governance is transformative. It aims not only to gain a louder voice within existing institutions but to fundamentally reform them and, where reform is deemed insufficient, to create parallel structures that operate on different principles, such as South-South cooperation and development finance without the political conditionalities often attached by Western lenders.

Table 1: A Comparative Snapshot

Metric	G7	BRICS+
Member Countries	Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, UK, US (+ EU as non-enumerated member)	Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, UAE, Saudi Arabia
Founding Principle	Coordination among advanced, liberal democracies to manage the global economy	Platform for emerging economies to counterbalance Western dominance and advocate for a multipolar order
Total Population (approx. 2025)	~790 million (10% of world)	~3.7 billion (45% of world)
Share of Global GDP (Nominal, approx. 2024)	~44% (down from 70% in 1980s)	~29%
Share of Global GDP (PPP, approx. 2024)	~28-30%	~36-40%
Share of Global Merchandise Trade (approx. 2023)	~29% (declining)	~23% (rising)

Source: International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, UNCTAD, and World Trade Organization (WTO)

The Shifting Economic Balance of Power

Macroeconomic Dominance – The Tale of Two GDPs

The most common metric of economic power, nominal GDP, shows the G7 still firmly in the lead. In 2024, the combined nominal GDP of G7 member states was approximately \$57 trillion, accounting for over 44% of the global total. This figure reflects the high-value, knowledge-based service economies, technological leadership, and entrenched control over the global financial system that characterise its members. The United States alone, with a GDP of around \$27 trillion, constitutes a significant portion of this total.

However, the narrative shifts entirely when measured by Purchasing Power Parity (PPP), which adjusts for differences in local prices and is considered a better gauge of the actual volume of goods and services an economy produces. On this metric, the expanded BRICS+ bloc has already overtaken the G7. As of 2024, BRICS+ accounts for an estimated 36% to 40% of global GDP in PPP terms, compared to the G7's share of approximately 28% to 30%. This crossover, which occurred around 2020, represents a historic rebalancing of the world's productive capacity away from the traditional industrialised nations.

This trend is set to accelerate due to starkly different growth trajectories. The mature, developed economies of the G7 are projected to grow at a modest rate of 1.2% to 1.7% annually. In contrast, the emerging economies of BRICS+ are forecast to grow at an average rate of 3.4% to 4.0%. According to IMF projections, nations like China and India will be the primary engines of global economic growth in the coming years, with China alone expected to contribute more to global growth than all G7 countries combined.

Despite this convergence in aggregate economic size, a vast gap in wealth and living standards persists. The average GDP per capita in G7 countries is around \$64,770, reflecting advanced infrastructure and high-income societies. The average for the original five BRICS nations is dramatically lower, around \$6,000, highlighting significant developmental challenges that persist despite rapid aggregate growth.

Production, Trade, and Resources

The shift in productive capacity is also evident in global trade and manufacturing patterns. The G7's share of global merchandise exports has been in steady decline, falling from 45.1% in 2000 to 28.9% in 2023. Over the same period, the share held by the BRICS+ group surged from 10.7% to 23.3%. This reflects the BRICS+ bloc's role as the world's industrial heartland, with China alone accounting for 28.7% of global manufacturing output. While G7 exports tend to be more diversified and concentrated in higher-value technological goods, the sheer volume of production has shifted decisively to the BRICS+ nations.

The 2024 expansion has transformed BRICS+ into a commodity superpower. The inclusion of Iran and the UAE, with Saudi Arabia's potential accession, means the bloc now contains several of the world's largest energy producers. It is estimated that BRICS+ members now account for approximately 43% of global crude oil production and 32% of natural gas output. This concentration gives the bloc significant potential influence over global energy markets. The group is also dominant in global agriculture, producing an estimated 42% of the world's wheat, 52% of its rice, and 46% of its soybeans. This control over essential food and energy resources represents a powerful form of economic leverage.

Demographics

Long-term economic potential is heavily influenced by demographic trends, an area where the divergence between the two blocs is most acute. The G7 nations collectively represent around 790 million people, or just under 10% of the world's population. More critically, they face a significant demographic drag from rapidly aging populations and low fertility rates. This trend places immense strain on public finances, healthcare systems, and labour markets, making sustained economic growth more difficult to achieve. In contrast, the expanded BRICS+ bloc is a demographic giant, home to approximately 3.7 billion people, or about 45% of the global population. Many of its key members, such as India, Indonesia, and Ethiopia, possess young and growing populations. This demographic dividend provides a vast potential workforce and consumer base that can fuel economic expansion for decades. However, this potential is contingent on the ability of these nations to provide adequate education, infrastructure, and employment opportunities for their burgeoning youth populations.

Financial Stature

In the financial realm, the G7's legacy dominance remains formidable, but BRICS is building a substantial base of its own. The original five BRICS members collectively hold an estimated \$5.2 trillion in foreign exchange reserves. This massive pool of capital provides a crucial buffer against external financial shocks and serves as the foundation for their strategic initiatives to promote trade in local currencies and

establish alternative financial institutions, thereby challenging the primacy of the U.S. dollar. Furthermore, the fiscal positions of the two blocs differ significantly. Many G7 nations are burdened by high levels of public debt, with an average general government gross debt of around 125% of GDP. Countries like Italy and Japan have debt-to-GDP ratios exceeding 100% and 200%, respectively. These high debt loads constrain their ability to respond to future crises with fiscal stimulus. While debt levels are rising in many emerging markets, BRICS+ countries generally have lower debt-to-GDP ratios, affording them greater fiscal flexibility for state-led investment in infrastructure and development.

The divergence between nominal and PPP-adjusted GDP is more than a statistical curiosity; it serves as a proxy for the ongoing global economic rebalancing. The G7's continued lead in nominal GDP reflects its historical dominance of the high-value, dollar-denominated global financial system. The BRICS+ lead in PPP GDP, conversely, reflects its growing dominance in the physical economy (manufacturing, resource extraction, and agriculture). The fact that the world's productive capacity has already shifted, while its financial and pricing power has not yet fully caught up, explains the core strategic motivation behind the BRICS+ push for de-dollarisation and the creation of alternative payment systems. It is a direct attempt to align global financial power with real-world productive power.

Table 2: Key Economic and Development Indicators

Metric	G7	BRICS+
GDP per Capita (Nominal, USD)	~\$64,770	Highly varied; average for original 5 ~\$6,000
Average Annual GDP Growth (Recent Projections)	1.2% - 1.7%	3.4% - 4%
Average General Govt. Gross Debt (% of GDP)	~125%	Generally lower, but varied
Average Human Development Index (HDI)	~0.9	~0.7 (for original 5)
Share of Global Manufacturing Output	Declining	Rising (China alone is ~29%)

Source: International Monetary Fund (IMF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Stated Objectives and Strategic Instruments

G7: Preserving and Adapting the Existing Order

The G7's primary objectives are rooted in its identity as the custodian of the liberal international order. Its core economic goal remains the coordination of macroeconomic policies to ensure global financial stability, a mandate that dates back to its founding. This involves managing responses to financial crises, setting standards for financial regulation, and, historically, coordinating on exchange rate policies.

Its core political objective is to function as a caucus of leading democracies to address a wide array of global challenges, including international security, terrorism, climate change, development, and human rights. The group's strategy is not to act as a formal world government but to build consensus among its influential members and then project that consensus through the formal international organisations where they hold significant sway, such as the UN Security Council, the IMF, and the World Bank.

To achieve these objectives, the G7 employs several key instruments:

Summits and Ministerial Meetings: The annual leaders' summit is the apex of the G7 process, setting the agenda and producing a final communiqué that signals the collective policy direction of the world's most powerful democracies. This is supported by numerous ministerial-level meetings on specific topics like finance, foreign affairs, and health.

Coordinated Sanctions: The G7 has proven to be a highly effective platform for designing and implementing multilateral economic sanctions. This tool of economic statecraft has been used most powerfully against Russia in response to its aggression in Ukraine, demonstrating the group's ability to act decisively in the security domain.

Development Aid and Strategic Initiatives: G7 members are the world's largest providers of Official Development Assistance (ODA), collectively accounting for over 70% of the global total. They also launch targeted initiatives to advance their strategic goals, such as the Partnership for Global Infrastructure and Investment (PGII), which was created to offer developing countries an alternative to China's Belt and Road Initiative, and major global health funds.

BRICS+: Building a Parallel, Multipolar Order

The objectives of BRICS+ are explicitly revisionist, aimed at rebalancing the global order. The bloc's core economic goal is to increase the influence of emerging economies in global financial governance and to create alternative systems that reduce their collective dependence on the U.S. dollar and Western-controlled financial institutions.

The core political objective is to establish a powerful and unified diplomatic platform for the Global South. Through this platform, the bloc advocates for what it terms a more "equitable and fair" multipolar world order, one that is based on the principles of sovereign equality, mutual respect, and non-interference in the internal affairs of states.

The instruments developed by BRICS+ are designed to build the foundations of this alternative order:

The New Development Bank (NDB): This is the flagship achievement and most concrete instrument of the BRICS+ agenda. Established in 2014 with an authorised capital of \$100 billion, the NDB's mandate is to finance infrastructure and sustainable development projects in its member countries and other emerging economies. It was explicitly created to be an alternative to the World Bank and the IMF, offering financing without the policy conditionalities often imposed by those institutions. As of late 2024, the NDB had approved approximately \$39 billion for 120 projects, demonstrating its transition from a political concept to a functioning multilateral development bank.

The Contingent Reserve Arrangement (CRA): Designed as a parallel to the IMF, the CRA is a \$100 billion fund intended to provide member countries with liquidity support during balance-of-payments crises. It represents a self-help mechanism to reduce reliance on the IMF in times of financial distress.

De-dollarisation Initiatives: This is a multi-pronged effort to chip away at the dominance of the U.S. dollar in global trade and finance. A key component is promoting the use of local currencies in trade among member states; the share of the Chinese renminbi in intra-BRICS transactions, for instance, has reportedly grown to nearly 47%. This effort is complemented by the development of alternative payment systems, such as BRICS Pay, and ongoing discussions about the potential for a common BRICS reserve currency.

Diplomatic Coordination: The annual BRICS+ summit, along with a network of over 60 intra-group forums and working groups, serves as the primary mechanism for forging common positions on global issues. These positions are then collectively advocated for at the United Nations, the G20, the WTO, and other multilateral bodies to amplify the voice of the Global South.

The contrast in these toolkits reveals a fundamental strategic difference. The G7's power is derived from its ability to exert influence within the existing system. Its members' dominant voting shares in the Bretton Woods institutions and permanent seats on the UN Security Council mean that the consensus reached in G7 communiqués can be translated into action through established, globally recognised channels. Lacking this level of institutional control, BRICS+ has been compelled to engage in the far more difficult and capital-intensive task of building a new system from the ground up. This dynamic makes the G7 more agile in responding to immediate crises but leaves it potentially vulnerable in the long term if the parallel institutions created by BRICS+ gain widespread legitimacy and financial scale.

A Comparative Assessment of Efficacy

G7's Case for Success

The G7's primary strength lies in its ability to function as a cohesive and effective crisis-management committee for the global economy and Western security interests. Its capacity to coordinate swift, unified responses to systemic shocks has been repeatedly demonstrated, most notably during the 2008 global financial crisis. At that time, G7 finance ministers agreed on an aggressive five-point action plan that included coordinated bank recapitalisations, liquidity injections from central banks, and enhanced deposit protection schemes. This decisive intervention is widely credited with averting a complete collapse of the global financial system.

Beyond crisis response, the G7 has played a leading role in advancing global public good initiatives. It was instrumental in launching the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, which has saved millions of lives. Through the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative, the group provided substantial debt relief to the world's poorest nations. Over the years, the G7 has consistently mobilised billions of dollars to support global health, vaccine distribution, and food security programmes, reinforcing its role as a key driver of international development.

In the realm of geopolitics, the G7 has shown notable unity and resolve in the face of major threats to the international order. Following Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022, the group acted in concert to impose the most severe and comprehensive economic sanctions ever levied against a major economy. These measures included freezing hundreds of billions of dollars in Russian central bank assets and coordinating extensive financial and military aid to Ukraine. This response reaffirmed the G7's position as the political and economic core of the Western alliance, capable of shaping global norms and defending democratic values.

G7's Enduring Challenges

Despite its historical successes, the G7 faces deep structural challenges that increasingly threaten its long-term influence on global governance. Chief among these is the erosion of its economic dominance. In the 1980s, G7 countries collectively accounted for nearly 70 percent of global GDP. Today, that share has declined to below 45 percent in nominal terms and approximately 30 percent in purchasing power parity (PPP) terms. This steady shift in global economic weight undermines the G7's authority and its longstanding claim to serve as the principal steering committee for the world economy.

Another critical challenge is the group's legitimacy and representation deficit. The G7 is often criticised as an exclusive club of wealthy Western nations that lacks the diversity needed to make globally representative decisions. Its continued exclusion of major emerging powers such as China and India is viewed by many as a strategic and self-limiting flaw, especially as these countries play increasingly central roles in global trade, finance, and diplomacy.

Internal cohesion also remains fragile. While the G7 has demonstrated unity in response to external threats, its internal dynamics are not immune to disruption. The presidency of Donald Trump in the United States revealed significant fractures within the group. His "America First" stance on trade and climate policy, coupled with open scepticism toward traditional alliances, strained the bloc's credibility and tested its ability to act in concert. These tensions underscore the need for renewed consensus and adaptability if the G7 is to remain a relevant force in shaping global outcomes.

BRICS+ Case for Success

The success of BRICS+ is best measured by its progress in constructing the institutional and diplomatic foundations of a multipolar world. The establishment and operationalisation of the New Development Bank (NDB) stands as the bloc's most significant and concrete achievement. In less than a decade, BRICS has moved from a political declaration to a fully functioning multilateral development bank with a growing portfolio of projects in sustainable infrastructure and clean energy. This has demonstrated an

ability to translate shared political ambition into durable, concrete institutions, a critical test of the bloc's viability.

BRICS+ has successfully established itself as the premier diplomatic forum for emerging economies and the broader Global South. The fact that dozens of countries have formally expressed interest in joining the group is a powerful testament to its growing appeal as a political and economic counterweight to the G7-dominated order. The successful expansion in 2024 has significantly enhanced its claim to represent the interests of the non-Western world.

The bloc has been highly effective in challenging the legitimacy of the post-war global governance architecture. It has successfully pushed issues that were once on the periphery, such as the need for IMF and World Bank quota reform and the risks of over-reliance on the U.S. dollar, to the centre of the global economic debate.

BRICS+ Enduring Challenges

The potential of BRICS+ remains fundamentally constrained by internal contradictions that limit its ability to evolve into a cohesive and influential global bloc. Chief among these challenges is the group's deep heterogeneity and underlying geopolitical rivalries. BRICS+ brings together a mix of democracies — such as India, Brazil, and South Africa — and autocracies like China, Russia, and Iran, each with divergent political systems, governance norms, and strategic priorities. This ideological divide is compounded by entrenched tensions, most notably the ongoing border conflict and strategic competition between India and China. Such friction imposes a hard ceiling on the prospects for meaningful political, economic, or military integration.

Beyond structural differences, the bloc suffers from a lack of a unified strategic vision. While BRICS+ members share a general desire to challenge Western dominance, there is little agreement on what a BRICS-led global order should entail. For China and Russia, the grouping increasingly serves as a platform for direct geopolitical competition with the West. In contrast, countries like India and Brazil view BRICS+ as a means to enhance strategic autonomy and navigate a multipolar world, rather than to form a rigid, oppositional alliance. This divergence in purpose weakens the bloc's coherence and limits its capacity to act collectively.

Economic imbalance further complicates the bloc's trajectory. China's economy dwarfs those of the other members combined, creating a structural asymmetry that influences decision-making and agenda-setting. Meanwhile, several members — including Russia and South Africa — face persistent economic stagnation and structural vulnerabilities. The addition of new members with distinct macroeconomic challenges only adds to the complexity, making coordinated economic policy and integration efforts exceedingly difficult.

Together, these internal fault lines constrain BRICS+ from fulfilling its aspirational role as a counterweight to Western-led institutions. Without greater alignment in vision, governance, and economic strategy, the bloc risks remaining a symbolic coalition rather than a transformative force in global affairs.

Arenas of Competition and Cooperation

Global Governance and International Law

The most fundamental area of competition lies in the very definition of the international order. The G7's approach is to uphold and defend the existing rules-based international order, a system grounded in the institutions and liberal norms established after World War II. Its communiqués consistently reaffirm its commitment to the UN Charter, international law, and principles such as human rights and democracy. The BRICS+ approach, in contrast, is one of active contestation and reform. The bloc calls for a more democratic and representative system of global governance that reflects the shift in global economic power. It champions a strict interpretation of state sovereignty and the principle of non-intervention, often opposing actions such as unilateral sanctions that are not explicitly authorised by the UN Security Council, viewing them as illegitimate infringements on national sovereignty. This creates a direct clash: the G7 defends the liberal international order, while BRICS+ advocates for a multipolar order with a different set of guiding norms.

Global Health

Historically, the G7 has been the primary engine and financier of global health initiatives, spearheading efforts like the Global Fund. The BRICS nations have carved out a different role, focusing on inter-bloc cooperation, leveraging their significant capacity for manufacturing low-cost medicines and vaccines (particularly India, China, and Brazil), and positioning themselves as development partners rather than traditional donors. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted both the potential and the pitfalls of this dynamic, exposing divisions within the BRICS bloc while also sparking intense vaccine diplomacy as a tool of soft power competition.

Climate Change

This is perhaps the most critical and contentious area. The G7 countries, which bear the greatest historical responsibility for emissions, are pushing for an accelerated global phase-out of fossil fuels. The BRICS+ nations, which now include the world's largest current emitter (China), other major emitters (India), and several of the world's largest hydrocarbon producers (Russia, Iran, UAE), argue for common but differentiated responsibilities. They stress their right to economic development and demand substantial financial and technological transfers from the G7 to support their energy transitions. With BRICS+ countries now accounting for approximately 50% of global CO2 emissions, compared to about 21% for the G7, no global climate solution is possible without the full participation of both blocs. This makes climate change a potential wedge issue that could drive the blocs further apart, but also one of the few areas where deep, functional cooperation is existentially necessary.

Technology Governance

The governance of artificial intelligence (AI) has become a key battleground. The G7 is actively working to establish global standards for AI based on democratic values, emphasising transparency, accountability, and the protection of human rights. In contrast, BRICS+, led by China's formidable tech sector, is developing and exporting alternative technological ecosystems. The bloc is also advocating for a UN-centric approach to AI governance, which could result in a different set of global standards with greater emphasis on state sovereignty over data and less stringent privacy protections.

Financial Systems

This is the most direct and consequential area of systemic competition. The G7 is the defender of the existing dollar-centric financial system, which operates through institutions like SWIFT and is underpinned by Western capital markets. The power to sanction and exclude countries from this system is one of the G7's most potent geopolitical tools. In direct response, BRICS+ is systematically building a parallel financial infrastructure. This includes the NDB as an alternative source of development finance, the promotion of local currencies for trade to bypass the dollar, and the development of alternative payment systems like BRICS Pay. The explicit goal is to create a multipolar financial world that is less vulnerable to G7 sanctions and control.

The Contours of a Multipolar World

The world is not witnessing a simple power transition from one hegemon to another, but rather the emergence of a dual-track global system characterised by the competing visions and capabilities of the G7 and the expanded BRICS+ bloc. The G7 remains a cohesive, technologically advanced, and financially powerful, but relatively shrinking, bloc of advanced democracies. The BRICS+ has become a larger, faster-growing, and demographically dominant, but internally divided and politically heterogeneous, coalition of emerging powers dedicated to challenging the status quo.

The future dynamic between these two groups will not be one of outright conflict or full cooperation, but a complex interplay of both. The most likely trajectory is one of deepening fragmentation of the global order, defined by three key trends:

- **Strategic Competition:** This will be the dominant feature, particularly in the realms of global governance, economic influence, and the setting of technological and financial standards.
- **Selective Cooperation:** Despite this overarching competition, pragmatic and selective cooperation will remain necessary to address existential shared threats. Challenges such as climate change, pandemic preparedness, and nuclear non-proliferation are of a scale that neither bloc can solve alone, compelling a degree of functional engagement even amidst geopolitical tension.
- **Systemic Fragmentation:** The most significant long-term outcome will likely be the hardening of parallel economic and financial systems. As BRICS+ continues to build out its alternative infrastructure (NDB, CRA, local currency trade), global interdependence, a hallmark of the post-

Cold War era, will likely decrease. This will create a more bifurcated world with distinct technological ecosystems, supply chains, and financial circuits.

These developments carry profound strategic implications for all international actors.

The dissolution of a unified global system has profound implications for governments, particularly middle powers. These nations now operate in a more fragmented geopolitical landscape, where navigating between competing blocs — such as BRICS+ and the G7 — requires careful strategic calibration. While this environment presents risks, including the potential to be caught in the crossfire of great power competition, it also opens up opportunities for enhanced strategic autonomy. By leveraging relationships across both blocs, middle powers can pursue more flexible and interest-driven foreign policies, positioning themselves as pivotal actors in a multipolar world.

For businesses and investors, geopolitical risk has shifted from a peripheral consideration to a central pillar of strategic planning. The bifurcation of global systems is reshaping the architecture of supply chains, financial flows, data governance, and technological standards. This fragmentation demands a more nuanced approach to global operations. Traditional diversification strategies, such as "China+1," are no longer sufficient. Instead, firms must adopt a more sophisticated framework that accounts for the distinct regulatory, political, and economic dynamics of the BRICS+ and G7 spheres. This recalibration is essential for identifying both risks and opportunities in an increasingly divided global economy.

Ultimately, the G7-BRICS+ dynamic is the central organising principle of the emerging multipolar world. The primary challenge for the G7 is to adapt its role from that of the undisputed global manager to the leader of a powerful, but no longer dominant, bloc. It must find ways to build broader coalitions beyond its core membership to maintain influence. The primary challenge for BRICS+ is to overcome its significant internal contradictions, most notably the rivalry between China and India, to translate its aggregate economic and demographic weight into effective, coherent global leadership. The stability and prosperity of the 21st-century international system will largely depend on how these two powerful and divergent blocs manage their complex and evolving relationship.



Contributors:

- **Zwelibanzi Maziya** | Chief Ratings Officer
- **Bekithemba Ndimande** | Rating Analyst
- **Ted Maselesele CA(SA)** | Rating Analyst
- **Lomanja Malaba** | Rating Analyst

Contact:

info@saratings.com

+27 10 203 9921

54 Queens Rd, Bryanston, Sandton, 2191,
Johannesburg, South Africa

www.saratings.com

The analysis in this document is provided for information purposes only and should not be construed as financial or investment advice, nor should any information in this document be relied on when making credit rating decisions. The opinions and views expressed reflect the current opinions and assumptions of the credit ratings team at Sovereign Africa Ratings. Actual results, performances, or events may differ materially from those expressed or implied in this document.