



**Technical Advisory Group
Minutes of the Seventh Meeting
September 17-18, 2012
Washington, DC**

Table of Contents

0	<i>Background</i>	1
1	<i>Session I. Revisiting the Linking and Aggregation Methods</i>	2
2	<i>Session II. Review of 2011 Preliminary Data and Results</i>	4
3	<i>Session III. Government Services and Construction</i>	5
4	<i>Session IV. ICP 2005 revisions and Extrapolation between benchmarks</i>	6
5	<i>Session V. Summary of Recommendations and Next Steps</i>	7
6	<i>Annex 1. Agenda</i>	11
7	<i>Annex 2. List of Participants</i>	13

0 Background

The Seventh Meeting of the 2011 ICP Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was held on September 17-18, 2012 at the World Bank in Washington, DC. The meeting was organized in five sessions per the agenda in Annex 1.

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, Western Asia, and Georgia. The ICP Global Manager and Global Office staff and consultants attended, in addition to observers from the World Bank Development Data Group and the Development Research Group.

The meeting was opened by Grant Cameron, manager in the Development Data Group speaking on behalf of its director, Shaida Badiee. He noted the progress to date in data collection and submission. He acknowledged that there are still some data problems, but that there is time to fix them. Grant went on to express his confidence that the remaining challenges will be met with the full support of the World Bank, which may include undertaking quality assessments in some countries to aid in the global data validation effort. He noted several important aspects highlighting the importance of this TAG meeting:

- The work plan for the following months is predicated on the fact the results will be published in December 2013. The report cannot be postponed as major users including the World Bank and IMF are awaiting the data for the poverty computations and quota exercise, respectively.
- The Executive Board is expecting the TAG assessment and recommendations on the feasibility of the linking approach based on the global core list, the quantification of importance indicators, and the quality of data and metadata submitted to date.
- The TAG is asked to review the findings of the Validation Expert Group and the PPP Computation Task Force and assess the quality of the results and underlying data.

He closed with the reminder that users of PPP data are expecting the World Bank to improve its method of extrapolating PPPs between benchmark years, and that TAG input is sought in this matter.

1 Session I. Revisiting the Linking and Aggregation Methods

Review of linking and global aggregation methods approved by the TAG

The TAG was provided a review of past decisions regarding the estimation of PPPs at the regional level and the linking method to ensure all were well understood before undertaking the data review and dealing with pending decisions on the inclusion of singleton countries, use of productivity adjustment for government services, and the presentation of the final results. This session included a review of the sources of variability underlying the estimation of PPPs, namely the Paasche-Laspeyres spreads from computing the Fisher indexes and the GEKS method to make them transitive. The review showed there are some countries that are significant outliers. That could be a result of data issues or simply because their economic structures differ so much from other countries. The frequency of these outliers occurring is likely to increase for 2011 as the number of countries with diverse economic structures has increased. It was suggested the TAG consider methods to include these countries without overly affecting PPPs of other countries. The effect of the outliers may differ depending on the regional and global aggregation methods. The GEKS aggregation method of estimating PPPs, which the TAG has recommended for use by all regions for their intra-regional estimation, gives equal weight to every country in a region. Likewise, the global GEKS/CAR aggregation method gives equal weight to every country included in the inter-regional estimation regardless of their size, quality and variability of the PPPs across basic headings, and the quality of the national accounts data.

The impact of the CAR global aggregation method was discussed; if it had been used in the 2005 ICP, there would have been some regional shifts in volume shares. Therefore, the TAG discussed various issues about what analysis the Global Office could provide to data users showing the effect of methodology changes including the CAR, the use of a global core list priced by all countries rather than the ring list used in 2005 only priced by a few countries in each region, use of importance and choice of weights, direct estimates for dwelling rents, and the comparison of the 2011 benchmark to the 2011 extrapolated estimates based on the simple GDP deflator extrapolation method.

The session ended with a discussion about how to include countries with significantly different and hard to explain price levels between 2011 and 2005. It was suggested statistical processes be used to identify them and to include them in the global results but to exclude

them from the estimation of the inter-regional links. This issue and the problem with outlier countries are also related to how countries that are not part of a specific region are to be included. Discussions about these issues continue in subsequent sessions with recommendations.

Estimation of PPPs for countries that are statistical outliers

Alan Heston presented a paper suggesting a weighted GEKS be used with the weights based on the Paasche-Laspeyres spread and provided an example using 2005 results. While there was general agreement about the usefulness of weights, the issue of choice of weights still requires further research and analysis before any changes could be recommended to the method currently proposed.

Angus Deaton presented a detailed method to estimate standard errors of the PPPs. One key finding was that multilateral comparisons have much higher standard errors than bilateral comparisons because the multilateral comparison brings in countries with diverse economic structures and also those that are so different that they could be classified as outliers. The global PPPs show more variability than those within regions, justifying the computation of within region PPPs (and regional fixity).

Another point raised was about data users who are only interested in PPPs between a set of countries such as PPPs for South American countries including Mexico and Chile, which are in the OECD comparison. The TAG has always taken for granted the need for a complete set of multilateral comparisons to obtain transitive results for all countries in the world. The TAG needs to understand the implications of allowing users to “re-compute,” based on countries of interest. The question for the Global Office is whether the Paasche and Laspeyres matrices *at the BH level?* could be released to data users to allow them to re-compute PPPs for a desired subset of countries. It is clear that the PPPs based on such a subset of countries will differ from those obtained from a global comparison; the TAG needs to document the reasons so that users are aware of the implications of any analysis based on source data for a subset of countries. For example, the pluses are that the countries concerned may have relatively similar economic structures, which should improve the quality of the comparisons, but one downside may be that a smaller number of priced products may be able to be matched when only a handful of countries is involved.

The outcome of these discussions was that countries with results greatly different from other countries should be treated differently. One suggestion was to bring countries into the estimation in stages. Another suggestion was to use the standard errors (or some other measures of between-country differences) as weights in the weighted GEKS. There was agreement the weighted GEKS had merit, but additional analysis is needed to determine the optimum weighting method.

Linking of Special Participation Cases

Iran and Georgia, for several reasons mostly political, are not part of a regional comparison. For linkage purposes, Iran is pricing the same set of household goods as those being used in Turkey. Iran would be linked into the global comparison after the global GEKS-CAR, using Turkey as a bridge. The same method will be used for Georgia with Armenia serving as the bridge. Similarly, the Pacific Islands will be linked to the global comparisons using the bridge country method.

Recommendations

- Further research should be conducted to determine whether it will be possible to estimate a set of weights that could be applied to countries in the process of global aggregation via the CAR method.
- Countries that are identified as outliers on the basis of a statistical analysis of their price levels should be included in the global results on the basis of their regional estimates but they should be excluded from the global aggregation (CAR) process so that they have no effect on the multilateral PPPs for all other countries.
- The TAG recommended Iran should be linked based on a bilateral bridge via Turkey for all GDP components.
- The TAG reaffirmed its previous recommendation that, while both Georgia and Iran will be included in the global comparison, they will not be included in the CAR global linking process so their PPPs will have no effect on the multilateral comparison PPPs for all other countries in the global comparison.

2 Session II. Review of 2011 Preliminary Data and Results

The TAG received a review of the data submitted to date by every region. This included data from both the regional price surveys and for those items in the global core list. Both sets of data were only for household consumption items where prices are obtained via price surveys. The results did not include data for dwelling rents, government, and capital formation. The use of the importance classification was also reviewed.

The outcomes of a review of the different stages of aggregation were provided for all levels of estimation. The review of the Quaranta tables used to validate prices within basic heading showed that some of the regions and countries need to more thoroughly edit the price data before moving on to stages of aggregation. The Dikhanov tables show similar results plus provide a validation across basic headings which also indicated more data validation is needed. Members of the Validation Expert Group provided a review of methods to validate data at the different levels of aggregation; these are a huge improvement compared with past methods that mostly accepted Basic Heading data “as is” for the aggregation.

The TAG reviewed the number of products priced by basic heading by country for both the regional price surveys and the set of global core products. Overall, most countries priced a large number of items from both lists. A TAG concern was whether enough countries submitted a sufficient number of item prices for the global core list to estimate the between region linking factors. The TAG concluded that countries priced enough items to ensure a robust linking of the regions at the total household consumption level.

The TAG reviewed the importance classification which is viewed as essential, especially for the set of global core items. The review showed, tentatively, that using the importance indicators move the results in the right direction. However, there are also inconsistencies in how the definition was applied. The TAG advised the regions that additional validation is needed and also pointed out that inconsistencies within and across regions could distort the resulting PPPs. The regions were advised to continue to work with the countries to improve their understanding of the method for both the regional and core lists.

Even though the data need more validation, preliminary (indicative) PPPs were computed for household consumption (excluding housing). The participants were reminded these were shown mainly to see where problems may exist between price levels from the core and regional list, weights used, etc. The Global Office emphasized that these preliminary data have not been systematically edited and that outliers were removed simply by deleting “extreme” prices (more sophisticated, less automatic, methods will be used in the final editing). As such, the data were only for illustrative purposes to show the methods previously recommended by the TAG are feasible in practice. In some cases, the final results may be very different once the prices have been edited using the Quaranta and Dikhanov tables and the new methods suggested by the Validation Expert Group. In addition, the national accounts expenditures were based on preliminary estimates for 2011, and a large number of basic heading expenditure values were imputed.

The analysis presented to the TAG included examples of outlier prices that were so different from other prices and countries that they skewed the PPPs across countries, even for broad levels of aggregation. Regional coordinators expressed concern about how to deal with the outlier prices if a country insisted they were correct. Similar concerns were expressed about countries not following procedures consistent with the rest of the countries such as the submission of metadata or submitting prices not comparable with those reported by other countries in the region. The TAG also recognized that some countries become statistical outliers simply because their respective price and economic structures are so different from other countries.

Recommendations

- Countries and Regional Coordinators should proceed with the data validation of the prices and importance classifications for both the regional and core lists.
- Based on data seen to date, the TAG reaffirms the use of the importance classification for the computation of basic heading PPPs at the within-region level and also for the estimation of linking factors. The TAG confirmed that the weights of 3:1 be applied to the important/not important prices in the estimation of within region basic heading PPPs and also the between region PPPs used to link the regions (but the effects of using other weights, such as 2:1, 5:1, 10:1 should be tested, as previously recommended by the TAG).
- In conjunction with the relevant Regional Coordinators, the Global Office will review the classification of products as “important” in cases for which there is a concern about possible misclassification. Based on the results of the review, the results for some basic headings (or for some countries in their entirety) may be excluded from the CAR-based global linking process. When outliers are present, a two stage process should be followed where the first stage includes all countries meeting data validation standards with the remaining countries then included in a way that does not have an effect on the first set of countries.

3 Session III. Government Services and Construction

Productivity Adjustment

The TAG agreed in previous sessions that PPPs for government services should be adjusted for productivity. The method proposed to the TAG is based on using a country’s

capital:labor ratio to estimate its labor productivity. Capital will be based on capital stock estimates which should be built up over time using the perpetual inventory model (PIM) and assumptions about the depreciation rates of different types of assets. As a result, gross fixed capital formation estimates will be required for each country for a long span of years, particularly for buildings which are assumed to have a 2% per annum depreciation rate. It will be necessary to impute estimates for countries that do not have sufficient national accounts data available for the PIM. Ideally the capital:labor ratio would be estimated by sector but it is likely that the 2005 approach will have to be adopted, i.e. of assuming that the labor productivity in the government sector is the same as that in the overall economy of a country. The main issue is for the Global Office to compile the necessary capital stock data, with the help of consultants.

Construction

The TAG in previous meetings made decisions regarding the use of input prices, the collection of data on markups, etc to partially convert them to output prices and whether or not to use productivity adjustments for labor. The TAG examined some experimental data showing that the shares of labor, materials and equipment did not vary much across countries, which was an unexpected outcome. The implication is that the lower price for labor in low-income countries compared with high-income ones was largely offset by the use of more labor in the former, with a similar (but opposite) effect for equipment. None of the discussions changed the previous TAG recommendations (i.e. to combine PPPs for materials, labor and equipment using weights for each country; to adjust the PPPs for markups and professional fees; and to make no adjustment for different levels of labor productivity, which will be taken account of by the weights being applied to the component PPPs in each country (the implication is that total factor productivity is constant across countries). However, the TAG will revisit this issue at its next meeting when more data are available.

Recommendations

- On productivity adjustment, the TAG concluded that productivity adjustment should be used for government services. Productivity adjustments will be applied to the government services PPPs at the global level. Regions are encouraged to make productivity adjustments as well. The TAG recommended that the Global Office should compile the necessary capital stock data.
- On construction, the TAG reiterated its previous decisions regarding the need to adjust the PPPs for markups and professional fees; and to make no adjustment for different levels of labor productivity.

4 Session IV. ICP 2005 revisions and Extrapolation between benchmarks

National Accounts Revisions

Some countries have made significant revisions to the 2005 GDP suggesting that the real expenditures for 2005 need to be revised. The issue is whether the revisions be made only at the level of the GDP where the 2005 PPPs would be used to deflate the revised nominal expenditures or whether the GDP should be disaggregated to lower levels, then aggregated back to the GDP. While there is agreement that the 2005 results should be revised to reflect

the new GDP data, no conclusion was reached how this should be done. The Global office will prepare a paper on different options for the regional coordinators to consider and prepare recommendations for the TAG to consider.

Extrapolation

The issue is that the World Bank extrapolates benchmark PPPs forward to provide estimates of real expenditures for years after the latest benchmark and for years between benchmarks. The World Bank has published extrapolated numbers for 2011 which will subsequently be compared with the 2011 benchmark results. Because of the methodological differences the numbers can differ significantly, putting both results in question.

Chapter 18 from the ICP book and papers by Deaton and Ravallion were reviewed by the TAG and discussed at length. There was agreement that better methods are needed and should be implemented before the 2011 benchmark results are published. Like it or not, the validity of the benchmark results will be gauged by the comparison with the extrapolated number, despite the documented shortcomings of broadly-based extrapolation methods, such as the GDP deflator comparison method.

Michel Mouyelo-Katoula and Nada Hamadeh proposed a method that would entail updating BH PPPs (or prices) and national accounts data each year and re-aggregating to the GDP.

Recommendations

- The TAG agreed that the National Accounts revisions should be reflected in 2005 results. The Global Office will prepare and circulate a note to explain how this can be best achieved given the time constraints.
- The TAG agreed that the extrapolation proposal set forth by Mouyelo-Katoula and Hamadeh was likely to produce more reliable results than the commonly-used method of extrapolating PPPs at the level of GDP and that it should be tested before the next TAG meeting.

5 Session V. Summary of Recommendations and Next Steps

The main purpose of the 7th meeting of the ICP Technical Advisory Group was to provide an assessment of the quality of the prices from the regional surveys and for the set of global core products that will provide the linking factors to combine the regional PPPs. The core list concept is an extension of the 2005 Ring list method; instead of only a few countries in each region pricing a separate list of global products, the core concept is based on a set of core products that become part of both the regional and global comparisons, thus can be priced by all countries. The quality of the core prices affects both the regional and global PPPs while the Ring prices only affected the estimation of the global PPPs. Therefore, the TAG felt it was necessary to review both sets of prices and their corresponding classifications of importance.

The TAG also reviewed the use of productivity adjustments for government compensation where decisions were still pending. The TAG also considered issues regarding revising the 2005 real expenditures to reflect national revisions to their GDPs. Finally, the TAG reviewed the methods used to extrapolate PPPs forward following the benchmark year and backward to the previous benchmark to form an annual time series of real expenditures.

Data review

The TAG was provided a detailed review of the data submitted to date by the respective regions. This analysis included data from both the regional price surveys and the regional price submissions for the global set of core prices that will be used to link the regions. However, some data problems were obvious in some regions, and it was clear that more detailed editing of the prices is required before the basic heading PPPs can be calculated with any degree of confidence.

Overall, a large number of items from both the regional and core lists have been priced. A review provided by the Validation Expert Group (VEG) pointed out many areas where further data validation is needed. This was especially true where price data that have been cleaned at the regional level are found to contain errors when compared across regions using the Dikhanov and Quaranta tables, and then using methods introduced by the VEG.

Outliers

The TAG discussed issues raised by prices called “outliers” because they differ so much from what other countries have submitted after being converted to a common currency (using exchange rates at this stage because product prices are not sufficiently clean to estimate and use PPPs). The TAG guidance was that the each Regional Coordinator and their countries should work together to determine whether to accept, modify, or reject some outlier prices. Because of the multilateral methods underlying the estimation of PPPs, an outlier price in one country can indirectly affect the between-country comparisons of all other countries in its region. Therefore, the TAG concluded that the regional coordinators and/or the Global Office should reserve the right to exclude outlier prices, as a last resort.

Global core list prices

Were enough prices provided for the global core list to ensure its use for linking regions? Not every country provided core product prices for every basic heading. However, after a review of the matrix showing the overlap of the number of products across regions, the TAG concluded that enough countries priced enough products to ensure a robust linkage of the regions at the overall household consumption level. In fact, some countries priced more core products than expected given the global nature of the list.

Importance classification

Therefore, the next step was to review the use of the “importance” classification used to identify products commonly purchased by a country’s consumers versus those products that may be available but not commonly purchased.

The TAG noted with pleasure the large number of products priced and the use of the “importance” classification. It also noted that there were some inconsistencies in the application of the importance definition, and that some countries either coded everything as “important” or declined to provide the classification. These inconsistencies across countries could affect both the intra-and inter-regional PPPs. The TAG guidance follows.

- Proceed with the data validation of the prices and importance classifications for both the regional and core lists.

- Based on data seen to date, the TAG reaffirms the use of the importance classification and that the weights of 3:1 be applied to the important/not important prices in the estimation of within region basic heading PPPs and also the between region PPPs used to link the regions. The TAG also requested results using alternative weights be provided for its review.

In conjunction with the relevant Regional Coordinators, the Global Office will review the classification of products as “important” in cases for which there is a concern about possible misclassification. Based on the outcome of the review, the results for some basic headings (or for some countries in their entirety) may be excluded from the CAR-based global linking process.

Estimation methods for outliers, singleton countries and Pacific Islands

The TAG discussed estimation methods for countries that are statistical outliers and others that are not part of a regional comparison (the Pacific Islands, the Caribbean, Iran, and Georgia). The main recommendation was that the PPPs be estimated in stages including different countries.. The method was proposed for outlier and singleton countries, which brings them into the comparison, but with results that do not affect the other countries in the multilateral comparison.

Related to the above issues, the TAG noted the concerns expressed by the regions where some countries are departing from agreed upon ICP procedures by submitting prices at levels inconsistent with other countries in the region, differing in application of the importance classification, and not providing metadata. The TAG recommended that these be dealt with by pursuing intensive data validation efforts and training on the methodology to provide a common understanding of the multilateral procedures. The TAG also noted that even when everything was done correctly, some countries differ so much in economic structure that the countries themselves become outliers. Therefore, the TAG concluded that there will be cases where the linking process will be done in two stages with the first stage including countries meeting the validation standards, and the second stage bringing in the remaining countries using methods agreed upon for countries not part of a specific region. The TAG encouraged the regions to follow the same procedures for the within region comparisons.

Productivity adjustments

Productivity adjustments will be applied to the government services PPPs at the global level. Regions are encouraged to make productivity adjustments as well. The main remaining issue is for the Global Office to arrange for the preparation of the capital stock and labor data required.

Comparing 2011 and 2005 results

The TAG discussed how to provide data users the background needed to compare the 2011 results with the 2005 benchmark. Three recommendations follow.

- Many countries have made extensive revisions to their 2005 national accounts. The TAG agreed that the National Accounts revisions should be reflected in 2005 results. The Global Office will prepare and circulate a note to explain how this can be best achieved given the time constraints.

- The results for 2011 will differ from 2005 because of some methodological changes (core vs. ring linking; method of aggregation (CAR for 2011); productivity adjustments; dwelling rents; construction; and additional countries). Therefore, the Global Office will, to the extent possible, provide data users a comparative analysis of the impact of the different methods.
- The 2005 revisions and the results of the 2005 comparative analysis should be provided when the 2011 data are released.

PPPs for non-benchmark years

As the use of PPPs increases, so does the need to have PPPs and real expenditures for the years in between benchmark periods and for years later than the most recent ICP round. These are provided by an extrapolation method and published in the World Bank Development Indicators (WDI) data base where extrapolated values for 2011 have been made available. The 2011 extrapolated results will also be compared against the 2011 benchmark—large differences will cast doubt on the ICP process. The TAG guidance follows.

- The most commonly-used extrapolation method is to compare price changes in GDP deflators for each country and a reference country (usually the USA) and apply them to the latest benchmark PPPs. Some very restrictive assumptions underlie this procedure and, as a result, there is an urgent need to improve the extrapolation process before the 2011 benchmark results are published.
- Several methods were reviewed. The proposal preferred by the TAG is that presented by Michel Mouyelo Katoula and Nada Hamadeh, which is to update Basic Heading PPPs (or prices) for household consumption each year using the respective CPI indexes at the most detailed level possible. PPPs (or prices) for basic headings in government consumption and gross fixed capital formation would be updated using national accounts deflators at the most detailed level possible. National accounts expenditures would also be updated each year. Then the PPP aggregation to the GDP can be completed using the same multilateral method used for the benchmark year.
- The extrapolated values for 2011 using this method would also be provided with the release of the 2011 benchmark values.
- The Global Office needs to provide the results of a test of this method for the next TAG meeting.

Summary

The TAG noted there are many data quality issues facing the regional coordinators and the Global Office, especially as they relate to the new methodology being implemented. In addition, results for housing, government, and capital formation remain to be seen. For these reasons, the TAG recommends it meets in May 2013 to review those data and provide guidance on remaining questions.

6 Annex 1. Agenda

Day 1: September 17, 2012

08:30 – 09:00	<i>Check in and breakfast</i>
09:00 – 09:15	Welcome comments and meeting objectives
<i>Session I</i>	<i>Revisiting the Linking and Aggregation Methods</i>
9:15 – 9:45	Review of linking and global aggregation methods approved by the TAG
9:45 – 10:45	Estimation of countries that are statistical outliers
10:45 – 11:00	<i>Coffee</i>
11:00 – 12:00	Linking of special participation cases Singleton countries Pacific Islands
<i>Session II</i>	<i>Review of 2011 Preliminary Data and Results</i>
12:00 – 12:30	Issues from the validation of preliminary data for TAG attention price data national accounts importance indicators
12:30 – 14:00	<i>Lunch</i>
14:00 – 14:30	Issues from the validation of preliminary data for TAG attention (Continued)
14:30 – 16:30	Issues from the computation of preliminary results and findings for TAG attention preliminary HHC PPPs use of weights for importance testing of the robustness of the linking factors

Day 2: September 18, 2012

08:30 – 09:00	<i>Breakfast</i>
<i>Session III</i>	<i>Government Services and Construction</i>
9:00 – 10:00	Productivity adjustments for government services PPPs
10:00-11:00	Outstanding issues on computing Construction PPPs
11:00 – 11:15	<i>Coffee</i>
<i>Session IV</i>	<i>Extrapolation</i>
11:15 – 12:00	Overview of current methods
12:00 – 12:30	Proposed approaches Consumer price indexes, purchasing power parity exchange rates, and updating Statistical approach to extrapolating PPPs

<i>12:30 – 14:00</i>	<i>Lunch</i>
<i>14:00 – 15:00</i>	Proposed approaches (Continued)
<i>15:00 – 16:00</i>	Implications on PPP time series
<i>Session V</i>	<i>Summary of Recommendations & Next Steps</i>
<i>16:00 – 17:00</i>	Open discussion about remaining research and analysis
<i>17:00 – 17:30</i>	Conclusions and recommendations

7 Annex 2. List of Participants

	Name	Organization
	TAG Members	
	McCarthy, Paul	Chair
	Vogel, Frederic	Deputy Chair
	Konijn, Paulus	Eurostat
	Ziechang, Kimberly	IMF
	Koehlin, Francette	OECD
	Deaton, Angus	Princeton University
	Sergeev, Sergey	Statistics Austria
	Diewert, Erwin	University of British Columbia
	Biggeri, Luigi	University of Florence
	Hill, Robert	University of Graz
	Timmer, Marcel	University of Groningen
	Douglas, May Julian	University of KwaZulu-Natal
	Heston, Alan	University of Pennsylvania
	Thomas, Jim	US Bureau of Labor Statistics
	Dikhanov, Yuri	World Bank
	Observers	
	Chinganya, Oliver	African Development Bank
	Muwele, Besa	African Development Bank
	Kouakou, Koffi Marc	African Development Bank
	Palanyandy, Chellam	Asian Development Bank
	Wang, Lei	China National Bureau of Statistics
	Kosarev, Andrey	CIS-STAT
	Goryacheva, Irina	CIS-STAT
	Accibas, Valerica	CIS-STAT
	Refayet, Md Ehras	George Washington University
	Graf, Brian	IMF
	Kuznetsov, Vasily	ROSSTAT
	Tatarinov, Andrey	ROSSTAT
	Savio, Giovanni	UN-ECLAC

	Marconi, Salvador	UN-ECLAC
	Goldszeir, Patricia	UN-ECLAC
	Skaini, Majed	UN-ESCWA
	Aten, Bettina	US Bureau of Economic Analysis
	Meikle, Jim	World Bank Consultant
	Blades, Derek	World Bank Consultant
	Roberts, David	World Bank Consultant
	Cameron, Grant	World Bank DECDG
	Fantom, Neil	World Bank DECDG
	Lee, Sup	World Bank DECDG
	Hexeberg, Barbro	World Bank DECDG
	Mistiaen, Johan	World Bank DECDG
	Prince, Will	World Bank DECDG
	Chen, Shaohua	World Bank DECRG
	ICP Global Office	
	Mouyelo-Katoula, Michel	ICP Global Manager
	Hamadeh, Nada	Senior Statistician
	Brannon, Morgan	Consultant
	Djayeola, Biokou Mathieu	Consultant
	Escaler, Federico	Consultant
	Jerbi, Imeddine	Consultant
	Prieto Oramas, Beatriz	Consultant
	Rissanen, Marko Olavi	Consultant
	Romand, Virginia	Consultant
	Song, Inyoung	Junior Professional Associate
	Walendom, Claude	Consultant
	Yamanaka, Mizuki	Consultant