



**Technical Advisory Group
Minutes of the Eighth Meeting
May 20-21, 2013
Washington, DC**

Table of Contents

0	Background	2
1	Preliminary Results for Household Consumption.....	2
2	Consistency between the 2005 and 2011 ICP Results for Chile	4
3	Assessing the Use of Importance Indicators.....	4
4	Preliminary Assessment of Government Wages Data.....	5
5	Preliminary Assessment of Construction Data	7
6	Preliminary Assessment of Machinery and Equipment Data	8
7	Housing Rents – Linking Eurostat-OECD to the Other Regions	8
8	Education – Linking Eurostat-OECD to the other regions	9
9	Linking the Pacific Islands.....	9
10	Global Linking Issues	9
11	Addressing Data Gaps in Special Survey Data and National Accounts Expenditures.....	10
12	Proposed ICP Revision Policy.....	11
13	Next Meeting.....	12
	Annex	14

0 Background

The Eighth Meeting of the 2011 ICP Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was held on May 20-21, 2013 at the World Bank in Washington, DC. The meeting was organized in seven sessions per the agenda in Annex 1. The main items on the agenda were to assess the preliminary results for 2011 for household consumption, compensation of government employees, construction and for machinery and equipment. In addition, addressing gaps in national accounts data and various issues associated with linking were also considered.

In attendance were TAG Chair, Deputy Chair, and members, as well as the ICP Regional Coordinators from Africa, Asia, the Commonwealth of Independent States, Eurostat-OECD, Latin America, Pacific Islands, Western Asia, and Georgia. The ICP Global Manager and Global Office staff and consultants attended, in addition to observers from the World Bank as listed in Annex 2.

Grant Cameron, manager in the Development Data Group opened the meeting and briefly described the objectives. Grant mentioned that the TAG had an important role in vetting the data collected for the 2011 ICP. The TAG would also be considering the outcome of tests on the sensitivity of different weighting patterns applied to importance indicators and several issues in the critical area of linking PPPs across regions. He said that the World Bank appreciated the TAG's important contribution to the ICP and wished the group well in its deliberations.

Objectives

Michel Mouyelo-Katoula, ICP Global Manager, described in more detail the objectives of the meeting. He said that it was unfortunate that the global datasets still contained gaps and some obvious errors, particularly inconsistent units of measurement. The prices data were scheduled to be provided to the Global Office by the end of March but some regions had not met this deadline. The most crucial output of the meeting was to examine the consistency of the global core prices and to discuss how best to handle outliers (either products or, in some cases, countries). A preliminary examination of the data indicated some inconsistencies between regions in some products (e.g. specifications in some cases and units of measurement in others). The late receipt of the prices data meant it had been necessary to clean the data by mechanically identifying and deleting outliers. However, Michel pointed out that this type of mechanical process would result in some legitimate prices being deleted and he said regions needed to more systematically edit their countries' data to avoid the need to use such a simple mechanical procedure. He also emphasized the need to make a final decision on the weights to be applied to "important/not important" products so that the Global Office could report to the Executive Board on this issue.

Michel requested the TAG provide input about other surveys including dwellings, government compensation, equipment, and construction. Other important topics to be considered by the TAG were the outcomes of a preliminary assessment and validation of the 2011 national accounts data and issues related to the consistency between the 2005 and 2011 ICP results.

1 Preliminary Results for Household Consumption

Issues

The data being used to estimate PPPs for household consumption (HHC) were not fully edited and so contained errors that had to be cleaned up to provide a reasonable indication of the final outcomes. The method used was to simply remove price observations for any individual product that were outside the range of $\pm \log 0.75$ of the CPD residual at the basic heading level in a region and outside the range of $\pm \log 1.75$ at the global level which meant that the PPP ratio (PPP product price/average PPP product price) had to be less than 1/5 or greater than 5 times the average PPP price to be flagged for deletion at the global level.

Sergey Sergeev, Robert Hill, Bettina Aten and Alan Heston presented the outcomes of their analysis of the data. Their methods varied, as did their means of presenting the results of their analysis, but the key point to emerge was that their conclusions were similar and they all identified some major consistency problems, both within and between regions. It is clear that a number of countries have misclassified importance, with an unbelievably high proportion of products classified as being important in some developing countries—over 90 percent in some countries despite them having relatively narrowly-based economies.

More price data are needed for some basic headings for some countries to make the linking process more robust. Electricity is a particular problematic group and needs further consideration by the Regional Coordinators to achieve greater consistency both within and between regions. The global comparability of regions has to be improved with Africa, Latin America and Western Asia requiring most attention. Reviewing the global Quaranta Tables will be an important part of this process.

Once prices have been validated, the next step is to compute basic heading PPPs and then review the range of these PPPs across the basic headings by country. These PPPs failed some basic edits, such as excessively large ratios between the maximum and minimum PPPs within a country with some exceeding 20,000. Ratios greater than 10 indicate likely data problems and any ratios greater than 20 should be examined carefully because they indicate potentially large data problems. Basic heading PPPs for Africa, Latin America and Western Asia will have to be recomputed once simple errors (such as those associated with units of measurement) are cleaned up and further intra-regional validation has been carried out. Some fine tuning is also required in the prices for Asia, CIS and Eurostat-OECD.

There are more basic headings than originally expected that have no prices for global core list products in one or more regions. As a result, it is likely that more reference PPPs will be used than had been planned.

Conclusions

- a. TAG members expressed some concern about the overall quality of the price data supplied to the Global Office, especially for the global core list. The price data from Africa, Latin America and West Asia need further intra- and inter-country validation (some countries were identified as requiring special attention).
- b. There is sufficient overlap of products priced to enable the regions to be linked to produce global results, despite some of the products differing significantly from one region to another. However, reference PPPs may have to be used more extensively than originally planned.
- c. The initial linking coefficients estimated generally seemed satisfactory (after prices were cleaned mechanically) and their consistency should improve once the prices are fully edited.

- d. The Global Office set a final deadline of end June for clean data to be supplied to the Global Office. The TAG emphasized the importance of this deadline being met by all regions to enable the CoTaF and VEG members sufficient time to undertake their analysis and circulate the outcomes to TAG members and Regional Coordinators at least two weeks prior to their meetings in the week starting 23 September.

2 Consistency between the 2005 and 2011 ICP Results for Chile

Issues

Chile participated in the 2005 ICP as part of the Latin America region but in 2011 was included in the Eurostat-OECD PPP Program. The OECD extrapolated the 2005 ICP real expenditures for Chile to 2011 for each of household final consumption expenditure, government final consumption expenditure, gross fixed capital formation, and GDP. Significant differences arose between the 2011 extrapolated estimates of real expenditure and the benchmarks from the 2011 Eurostat-OECD PPP round, with the two largest being differences of 25% for government final consumption expenditure and 19% for GDP.

An analysis identified two items that explained the bulk of these two discrepancies. The first was in government education, which was estimated differently for Chile in the two rounds (inputs, based largely on wages for teachers, in 2005 and outputs, based on the number of students, in 2011). An estimate of output-based education for 2005 explained the whole gap between the 2011 extrapolated real expenditure and the benchmark. It also partly explained the 19% difference in GDP.

Chile's terms of trade changed significantly between 2005 and 2011. Extrapolating PPPs from 2005 to 2011 using the GDP deflator method treats the terms of trade effects as price changes whereas they are included as volume changes in a benchmark PPP estimate. Adjusting for this effect, in conjunction with the adjustment to government education, brings the GDP estimate extrapolated from 2005 to 2011 almost completely into line with the 2011 benchmark estimate.

Conclusions

- a. It is inevitable that there will be differences, some of them substantial, between 2011 benchmark estimates of real expenditure on GDP and the 2011 estimates based on extrapolating the 2005 benchmarks using the GDP deflator method. The OECD work on reconciling the 2011 estimates for Chile has provided an example of the type of analysis that is likely to be required to explain differences between 2005 and 2011 ICP results.
- b. Any extrapolation procedures used should focus on using domestic absorption with net exports treated separately using the exchange rate as a reference PPP rather than extrapolating at the level of total GDP.

3 Assessing the Use of Importance Indicators

Issues

Sergey Sergeev and Yuri Dikhanov each presented an analysis of the impact of using importance indicators in estimating PPPs and the effects of using different weights for the

important products (each of 2:1, 3:1, 5:1 and 10:1). Prasada Rao presented a theoretical example which demonstrated that using importance indicators results in estimates that are closer to the true estimates than is the case when ignoring the importance indicators (in effect, giving important and non-important prices equal weights), even if some countries have not correctly classified importance.

The analysis showed that the allocation of the importance indicators varied by region. Several TAG members commented that this was to be expected, with higher-income countries more likely to have a higher share of products priced identified as being important. However, it seems clear that some countries have not interpreted the concept correctly (e.g. low-income countries pricing a large number of products and declaring most of them important). On the other hand, even in those countries, it is likely that the products that are classified as not being important are probably classified correctly and so this adds information to the process.

The TAG noted that the results of the analysis show that taking account of the importance indicators affects the PPPs in the way that would be expected (i.e. applying a higher weight to the important products lowers the PPPs compared with applying equal weights to important and non-important products). However, the allocation of importance indicators needs to be reviewed further by the Regional Coordinators, using Global Office guidelines, to improve the consistency of their allocation across countries within regions.

Sensitivity was tested by applying different sets of weights (i.e. 2:1, 3:1, 5:1 and 10:1) to the important/non-important products. The effect when the 3:1 weights were applied was broadly similar to that with a 10:1 weight. A majority of the TAG members considered that applying differential weights to the important and non-important products added value to the estimated PPPs because they reflect the larger expenditure shares of important products. The most appropriate weights were thought to be 3:1. While this ratio is arbitrary, the TAG pointed out that not applying a differential weight for importance is the same as assigning equal weights to both important and non-important products, which is arbitrary and discards useful information.

Conclusions

- a. The TAG recommended that importance indicators should be used in the 2011 ICP because they added value to the estimated PPPs by reflecting the larger expenditures for important products.
- b. The TAG recommended that weights of 3:1 be applied to the important/non-important products at both regional and global levels.

4 Preliminary Assessment of Government Wages Data

Issues

There are variations both within and between regions in the ways in which wages have been reported for government employees. For example, not all countries have reported wages for the four “experience categories” (i.e. an entry-level employee, one with 5 years experience etc.). Instead, some of the wages reported are averages rather than by level. As a result, there are gaps in the overlaps when it comes to linking across regions. However, an analysis of the results has shown that the differences between the grade by grade PPPs and those based on an overall average are relatively small in most, but not all, cases.

The wages collected for most regions have large variations between those for the highest and lowest income countries. World-wide, the variation in wages ranges from 2 for Madagascar (on a base of the world = 100) to 1283 for Switzerland. The implication is that productivity differences between the high and low wage countries are very large. The TAG has already recommended that productivity adjustments should be made to wages in all regions when they are being linked to provide global results. It is clear that similar adjustments are required within regions to avoid the wage comparisons being distorted. Asia and Africa have wide variations in wages between the high and low income countries. The data are also incomplete in some countries (e.g. only a single wage rate, such as entry level, being reported).

The OECD and Eurostat do not collect wages for the four different “experience categories” and so, in effect, only an average wage is available. Solutions proposed would be either to link average wages to a single experience category (10 years experience) or to include average wages as an extra variable and run the CPD over all items (i.e. each level is a separate item and the average is an additional one).

A number of African countries reported only “base pay” wages rather than total remuneration so their data were not consistent with those from other African countries despite the base pay PLIs being relatively similar in many cases to those based on total remuneration. However, there were sufficient countries with large differences to indicate that base pay PPPs need to be treated separately from total remuneration PPPs. The possible solutions regarding global linking would be to either exclude those countries reporting only base pay from the global linking process or to split Africa into two sub-regions based on the wages details reported. The TAG considered that it would be undesirable to exclude a significant number of countries from the global linking process and so recommended that Africa should be treated as two sub-regions for the purposes of the global linking of the wages data. Countries that provided only base pay will be linked via countries that provided both total remuneration and base pay. Only countries with total remuneration wages will be used for the global linking.

When estimating an average wage from the four experience categories (i.e. entry level, 5 years experience, 10 years experience and 20 years experience) it is necessary to apply weights (number employed) to each of the categories. It is apparent that most countries do not have the information required to estimate these weights. The TAG considered that individual countries are best placed to estimate the weights (e.g. derive weights based on the age structure of the working population). In the absence of specific details, the relevant Regional Coordinator should recommend a weighting pattern (using numbers of employees or expenditures) to be applied either throughout the region or for sub-groups of countries within the region.

The TAG reaffirmed its recommendation that productivity adjustments should be made within all regions and are mandatory between all regions in the global linking.

Conclusions

The TAG recommended that:

- a. Average wages across the experience categories should be estimated where possible and included as an extra variable in the CPD (i.e. in addition to wages for each of the experience categories).
- b. Africa should be split into 2 sub-regions for the global linking to ensure that all possible African data are included in the linking. The split would include countries

reporting only base pay in one region and those reporting total remuneration in the other. Countries that provided only base pay will be linked via countries that provided both total remuneration and base pay. Only countries with total remuneration wages will be used for the global linking.

- c. Productivity adjustments should be made within all regions and are mandatory between all regions in the global linking (reaffirming an earlier decision).

5 Preliminary Assessment of Construction Data

Issues

The prices for construction still require editing within the regions. However, it is clear there is sufficient overlap for global linking to be successful, with several OECD-Eurostat countries pricing the global construction list to provide an overlap between that region and the other regions.

The data provided by some countries on the relevance of material inputs to the different types of construction is not satisfactory (e.g. a wash basin being shown as relevant to engineering construction). The Global Office proposed that a general set of relevance indicators should be used within each region rather than those provided by individual countries. The precedent for this was set in ICP 2005 where the Global Office established guidelines on where each product would be included. The quality of the data on mark-ups and professional fees has proven to be patchy and incomplete and the Global Office considers it is not feasible to use these data. There is also a consistency problem with the prices provided for equipment hire with some countries pricing hire with an operator (as required by the specifications) while others have provided prices that do not include an operator. The TAG recommended that separate items be specified for hire with and without an operator. Further data validation is required.

The first stage of estimation is to obtain separate PPPs for materials, equipment, and labor within the residential, non-residential, and civil engineering basic headings. Within each basic heading, the PPPs for materials, equipment, and labor are averaged using the relative share of each component. These weights have been provided by 80 countries. The Global Office divided the remaining countries into low, medium and high income categories and provided weights for each component by type of construction.

The issue arose of whether or not productivity adjustments are required for the labor component of construction. The TAG concluded at its 6th meeting in October 2011 that "...there is no need to adjust for labor productivity differences between countries", which means that "..., an underlying assumption is that total factor productivity (TFP) is equal across countries". No-one provided any reason for the TAG to reconsider this issue.

Conclusions

The TAG recommended that:

- a. A single set of relevance indicators is to be used within each region rather than those provided by individual countries. Each region will use a construction expert to provide advice on the relevance of the various components to the different types of construction activity.

- b. Resource weights provided by the Global Office will be used to average PPPs for materials, equipment, and labor for countries not able to provide the data.
- c. The construction prices should not be adjusted for mark-ups and professional fees, given the poor quality of the data collected on these aspects.
- d. The prices for equipment hire should be split into those including an operator and those excluding an operator and treated as separate product specifications.

6 Preliminary Assessment of Machinery and Equipment Data

Issues

The comparability across regions of the prices for machinery and equipment is adversely affected by differences in the products priced, particularly those with generic (i.e. loosely-defined) specifications. This problem will be discussed at the Regional Coordinator's meeting later this week.

Conclusion

The TAG noted that the prices for machinery and equipment were now available for most regions but that further editing and matching are required.

7 Housing Rents – Linking Eurostat-OECD to the Other Regions

Issues

Eurostat and the OECD use a combination of a rental price approach and a quantity approach to estimate dwelling rents. Eurostat and the OECD have investigated how to best link their estimates of real expenditures on dwelling rents to other regions. Data on both area (square meters) and numbers of dwellings are available for Eurostat-OECD countries. The quality of the data on area is relatively poor so the testing was carried out using numbers of dwellings.

The results showed that linking to other regions via this method is feasible and the results appear plausible. Further testing will be undertaken to fully evaluate the results once the rents data are available for all regions. Eurostat and OECD will make also make available to the Global Office their rental data for further analysis of the linking options.

Alan Heston reported on the usefulness of some quality indicators. Air conditioning and central heating have proven to be not useful and so will not be included in the estimation. The age of houses has not been reported well and cannot be included in the calculations. However, adjusting for the age of apartments appears to provide reasonable results. The rent CPDs are plausible, although the Asia/Pacific region's data were not available. The CPDs will be re-run once these data are provided to the Global Office.

Conclusion

The TAG agreed that Eurostat-OECD estimates of real expenditures on dwelling rents should be linked to other regions using a quantity approach based on numbers of dwellings, provided that the results are plausible once all regions' data are included.

8 Education – Linking Eurostat-OECD to the other regions

Issues

Eurostat and the OECD use a quality-adjusted (with PISA scores) weighted output method to estimate real expenditures of education while all other regions use an input method. Ten countries from these other regions (1 in Africa, 4 in Asia and 5 in Latin America) have the data available to replicate the Eurostat-OECD output methodology thereby providing a link. An analysis by the OECD and Eurostat showed that the data in the Latin American countries (Brazil, Peru, Colombia, Uruguay and Panama) provided the best means of linking. Therefore, the link between the Eurostat-OECD region and the four regions coordinated by the Global Office would be through the Latin American region.

Conclusion

The TAG agreed with the proposal that the Eurostat-OECD real expenditures on education should be linked to Latin America via the above five countries. Links between all other regions would be based on a productivity adjusted input method.

9 Linking the Pacific Islands

Issues

The Pacific Islands are collecting prices only for products included in household consumption. Most of these countries do not have expenditure-based estimates of GDP and so they have no estimates of expenditures on household consumption. However, some have conducted household expenditure surveys in recent years and so a rudimentary set of weights could be derived, although it will be necessary to allocate expenditure shares on the basis of the “similar economy” method.

The Pacific Islands tend to have quite narrowly-based economies. Therefore, linking to the rest of the world via a single country (Fiji was the original proposal) could be problematical and so the Australian Bureau of Statistics proposes to use a three-country link, using Fiji, Australia and New Zealand.

Conclusion

The TAG noted the progress being made in the Pacific Islands and agreed with the proposal to use Fiji, Australia and New Zealand as a bridge to link them to the rest of the world. As a result, the Pacific Islands would not be included in the global linking process.

10 Global Linking Issues

Issues

Fred Vogel reviewed the decisions the TAG has already taken on global linking. TAG members did not see a need to reconsider any of these decisions.

The current plan is to link the CIS countries to Eurostat-OECD via Russia as a bridge country. However, these countries have also submitted prices for the global core list and other

aggregates. The Global Office will provide an analysis of the effect of the direct linking using the core list approach.

The other issues considered related to linking singleton countries and the Caribbean into the global results. The TAG agreed that, in principle, the Caribbean countries should be included in the global linking which would mean that Latin America and the Caribbean would be treated as an integrated region. The alternative would be to treat each of the Caribbean and Latin America as separate regions and for the Caribbean to be linked to the rest of the world via a link through the Latin American region. The Global Office will decide on which of these two approaches should be adopted once the Caribbean data are available (end June).

During an earlier meeting the TAG decided that the singleton countries (Georgia and Iran) would not be included in the global linking. Rather, they are to be linked into the global results via a single-country bridge approach (Georgia via Armenia and Iran via Turkey). Likewise, the TAG decided that the Pacific Islands would not be included in the global linking. The only substantive issue was how to link the construction basic headings for Iran into the global results because Turkey uses the Eurostat, model-based, approach to construction while Iran has priced the Global Office construction product list. The TAG agreed that Iran's construction PPPs could be linked through any other country using a similar approach. The Global Office will liaise with the Iran to identify an appropriate country to provide the link.

The global nature of the CAR linking and aggregation requires special attention of the inclusion of countries in the global matrix. The matrix would include 150 countries excluding the Caribbean, Pacific Islands, and singleton countries. The matrix would grow to include 179 countries if the Caribbean were included. The impact of adding these countries should be evaluated.

Conclusions

- a. The TAG recommended that the Caribbean countries should be integrated into a "Latin America and the Caribbean" region and included as part of the global linking process. However, the Global Office will make a decision on this issue, in conjunction with the Latin American Regional Coordinator, at the end of June when the Caribbean data are all available.
- b. The TAG reaffirmed that the Pacific Islands and the singleton countries (Georgia and Iran) should be linked into the global results rather than being included in the global linking process.

11 Addressing Data Gaps in Special Survey Data and National Accounts Expenditures

The Global Office has worked on the principle that all countries participating in each region should be included in both the regional results and the global linking process. An examination of the data supplied so far has shown that there are a number of different data gaps – prices not collected for any products in one or more basic headings, prices deleted through the editing process, prices available for a product but there is no match with any other country (could be intra-regional but, more commonly, is inter-regional). The national accounts data also contain numerous gaps, such as 2011 GDP not yet available, limited basic

heading detail available (or even none in some cases). In addition, methodological inconsistencies have resulted in some implausible basic heading expenditures being reported.

The TAG considered the extent to which gap filling can be used so that a country can continue to participate in the ICP, even with a much reduced dataset. The extreme would be a country that did not report GDP for 2011 and the TAG agreed that it would be impossible for such a country to participate because the 2011 GDP estimate is an essential component of the ICP. If a country can supply a GDP estimate but with limited basic heading details then it should be possible to gap fill by using the expenditure structure of a similar country (or perhaps the average of several countries). In such cases, it would be essential for the gap-filling procedures adopted to be fully documented in the country's metadata.

Techniques for gap-filling for missing prices include the method commonly used in price indexes of imputing the price index (in this case, a PPP) for the next higher-level product group to the basic heading. Reference PPPs from other components could also be used, with decisions on the most appropriate ones being made on a case-by-case basis.

The TAG agreed that gap filling of these types could be used so that a country with limited data can continue to participate at the regional level. However, if reference PPPs or reference basic heading values are used to a large extent then the country involved should be excluded from the global linking process. In making such a decision, the potential significance of the gap-filled basic headings should be taken into account.

The above factors need to be considered when determining the countries to be included in the global aggregation vs. inclusion after linking per the methods described above for singleton countries, the Pacific Islands, and possibly the Caribbean countries.

Countries in the Pacific Islands region priced only HHC items. An issue remaining for discussion is the method to impute real expenditures at the GDP level. Many users, especially the IMF, will need real expenditures at the GDP for all countries. Methods used to impute in ICP 2005 can be used for ICP 2011.

Conclusion

- a. The TAG recommended that any country that does not report 2011 GDP should be excluded from the ICP. The Global Office and TAG need to consider methods to impute real expenditures for these countries to meet data user requirements.
- b. The TAG agreed that gap-filling for missing prices and/or basic heading expenditures is an appropriate procedure to ensure a country can be included in the regional ICP results. If the gap filling is extensive then the country concerned should be excluded from the global linking process even though it has been included in the regional results.

12 Proposed ICP Revision Policy

Nada Hamadeh presented the World Bank's proposals for revising ICP results. Such a policy is needed because of the extent of revisions to the 2005 national accounts data since the GDP estimates were provided for the 2005 ICP (in mid 2007). The prices for products are not revised once they have been collected. However, PPPs could potentially change as a result of the revised GDP estimates resulting in different structures of expenditures underlying GDP

which changes the weighting patterns used to combine lower-level PPPs into higher-level ones. On balance, though, the impact from this source would be relatively small compared with the effects on real expenditures of the revised national accounts data.

Real expenditures could be revised in two different ways. The first would be to assume that the PPPs at all levels remain the same despite the changed GDP and underlying expenditure structures and simply apply them to the revised expenditures at all levels, including GDP. The alternative would be to fully recompile PPPs and real expenditures above the basic heading level. In both cases, an issue that needs to be considered further is the fixity of regional results. For example, if the only countries that have revised their national accounts are all in the same region then it would be logical for each country's share of regional GDP to change and for that region's share of world expenditures to change.

In principle, the benchmark PPPs (2005 at present but also 2011 as from next year) should be revised every year to take account of each country's latest GDP estimates. The WDI's extrapolated estimates would also have to be revised at the same time to take the new benchmarks into account. The database incorporating the estimates should retain all the different vintages of data so that revisions to both the benchmarks and the extrapolated datasets can be analyzed.

Conclusions

The TAG agreed that a revision policy is required and that the Global Office's proposals are a useful starting point. The issues that need to be considered in more detail are whether or not PPPs should be fully recompiled or remain fixed at the published levels, the structure of the database required to store different vintages of data and whether or not fixity should be retained and the implications of doing so.

13 Next Meeting

The Global Office proposed that the next TAG meeting should be held on 25-27 September in Washington. It will follow the Regional Coordinators' meeting (23, 24 September) rather than precede it as has been the practice previously.

Annex 1. Agenda

Day 1: May 20, 2013

<i>09:00 – 09:30</i>	<i>Check in and breakfast</i>
<i>09:30 – 09:45</i>	Welcome comments and meeting objectives
Session I	Overview of Preliminary Results for Household Consumption
<i>09:45 – 10:45</i>	Review and discussion of preliminary results for Household Consumption
<i>10:45 – 11:00</i>	<i>Coffee</i>
<i>11:00 – 11:30</i>	Review and discussion of preliminary results for Household Consumption (Continued)
<i>11:30 – 12:30</i>	Preliminary assessment of Housing data
<i>12:30 – 14:00</i>	<i>Lunch – hosted by DECDG</i>
<i>14:00 – 14:30</i>	Preliminary assessment of Private Education data
Session II	Consistency Between ICP 2005 and 2011 Results
<i>14:30 – 15:15</i>	Review of the consistency between ICP 2005 and 2011 results – The case of Chile
Session III	GEKS Weights and CPD Weights
<i>15:15 – 16:00</i>	CAR approach to linking and GEKS weights
<i>16:00 – 17:00</i>	Assessment of the use of importance indicators and various weights

Day 2: May 21, 2013

<i>08:30 – 09:00</i>	<i>Breakfast</i>
Session IV	Preliminary Assessment of the Quality and Completeness of Non-Household Consumption Data
<i>09:00 – 09:30</i>	Preliminary assessment of Government Compensation of Employees data
<i>09:30 – 10:15</i>	Preliminary assessment of Construction data
<i>10:15 – 10:45</i>	Preliminary assessment of Machinery and Equipment data
<i>10:45 – 11:00</i>	<i>Coffee</i>
Session V	Linking Regions – Outstanding Items
<i>11:00 – 11:30</i>	Overview of outstanding linking items
<i>11:30 – 12:30</i>	Linking special surveys with OECD/Eurostat: The cases of Housing and Education
<i>12:30 – 14:00</i>	<i>Lunch break</i>

<i>14:00 – 14:45</i>	Linking the Pacific
<i>14:45 – 15:30</i>	Addressing data gaps in special survey data and national accounts expenditures
Session VI	ICP Revisions
<i>15:30 – 16:30</i>	Proposed ICP revision policy
Session VII	Summary of Recommendations & Next Steps
<i>16:30 – 17:00</i>	Conclusions and recommendations

Annex 2. List of Participants

Name	Organization
TAG Members	
McCarthy, Paul	Chair
Vogel, Frederic	Deputy Chair
Biggeri, Luigi	University of Florence
Deaton, Angus	Princeton University
Diewert, Erwin	University of British Columbia, Vancouver
Dong, Qiu	Beijing Normal University (China)
Heston, Alan	University of Pennsylvania
Hill, Robert	University of Graz
Koechlin, Francette	OECD
Konijn, Paulus	Eurostat
May, Julian (apology)	University of KwaZulu-Natal
Rao, Prasada	University of Queensland
Sergeev, Sergey	Statistics Austria
Silver, Mick	IMF Statistics Department
Thomas, Jim	US Bureau of Labor Statistics
Timmer, Marcel	University of Groningen
Zieschang, Kimberly	IMF Statistics Department
Regional Coordinators	
Accibas, Valerica	Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-STAT)
Chinganya, Oliver	African Development Bank (AfDB)
Goryacheva, Irina	Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-STAT)
Kosarev, Andrey	Interstate Statistical Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS-STAT)
Kouakou, Marc Koffi	African Development Bank (AfDB)
Kouznetsov, Vasily	Russian Federal State Statistics Service (ROSSTAT)
Maritz, Athol	Australian Bureau of Statistics
Muwele, Besa	African Development Bank (AfDB)
Palanyandy, Chellam	Asian Development Bank (ADB)
Paz Collinao, Maria	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UN-ECLAC)

Roberts, David	Consultant, World Bank representing Georgia
Savio, Giovanni	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (UN-ECLAC)
Skaini, Majed	UN-ESCWA
VEG/CoTaF members (non-TAG)	
Aten, Bettina	US BEA
Refayet, Ehraz	George Washington University
Observers	
Cameron, Grant	Manager, DECDG, World Bank
Dong, Yu Fang	National Bureau of Statistics, PRC
Lanjouw, Peter	Research Manager, World Bank
Van der Weide, Roy	Economist, World Bank
ICP Global Office	
Mouyelo-Katoula, Michel	ICP Global Manager
Brannon, Morgan	Consultant
Dikhanov, Yuri	Senior Economist/Statistician
Djayeola, Biokou Mathieu	Consultant
Escaler, Federico	Consultant
Hamadeh, Nada	Senior Statistician
Rissanen, Marko Olavi	Consultant
Romand, Virginia	Consultant
Song, Inyoung	Junior Professional Associate
Yamanaka, Mizuki	Consultant