

## Some considerations on production and publishing ICP additive results (ICP TAG meeting / VC, Nov 2021)

The EKS results are non-additive and therefore are not very appropriate for the structural analysis. However, the ICP will not change the official aggregation method. Therefore, there are the proposals to produce and publish two sets of the results: official EKS results for volume and price level inter-country comparisons<sup>1</sup> and non-official results by an additive method for structural analysis. Respectively the **MINUTES OF THE ICP TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP** (May 17-19, 2021 / Virtual meeting) say on page 5: “*It was noted that, while the ICP has opted to maintain its PPP estimation methods, **this should not prevent research being conducted on the use of alternative estimation methods and approaches.***” This refers, first of all, to the use of additive methods to allow straightforward structural analysis.

Some considerations on potential production and publishing ICP additive results are presented in this notice. The following points are considered:

### 1) Choice of the most appropriate additive method

The following additive methods were used in the ICP in the past:

- **Geary-Khamis (GK)** – ICP 1970-1985
- **Ikle-Dikhanov-Balk (IDB)** – Africa (AfDB) 2005
- **Gerardi (G)** – Eurostat 1975

All these methods are based on the average international prices<sup>2</sup> obtaining from national prices: GK – Arithmetic Mean with quantity weights, IDB – Harmonic Mean with expenditure weights, G – unweighted GM<sup>3</sup>.

The author of this notice calculated the Average absolute % difference: ICP 2017 PPPs by additive methods (without regional fixity) vs “Official EKS-PPPs with fixity” (W143=1) for GDP. Domestic absorption and Household consumption expenditure (domestic)<sup>4</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup> The official GEKS method should not be considered as an “ideal” method. Fisher-PPP satisfies the economic approach to index number theory (F-PPP can be presented also as the PPP based on average arithmetic unweighted international prices of both countries => F-PPPs is a bilateral case of the Van Yzeren approach). The GEKS is based on binary superlative F-PPPs but the GEKS per se is a fully mechanical construction from direct and indirect bilateral PPPs and many of them have no any economical sense.

<sup>2</sup> There are several other methods based on the international average prices (e.g., Van Yzeren, CPD-Rao) but they are not strictly additive.

<sup>3</sup> Speaking strictly the Gerardi method is based on the averaging of national price ratios (price structures) but not on the averaging of the national prices. There are other additive methods using structural prices - see the paper published on the ICP World Bank web-site: S. Sergeev “*Aggregation methods on the basis of structural international prices*” Joint World Bank - OECD Seminar on PPPs „Recent Advances in Methods and Applications“ (Washington, D.C.; 30.01-02.02 2001)

<http://pubdocs.worldbank.org/en/368801510177722619/pdf/ICP-TF-PCC01-Doc-Aggregation-methods-on-the-basis-of-structural-international-prices-Sergeev-2001.pdf>

Aggregation methods on the basis of structural international prices described in the paper (MPCP = Maximal Possible Characteristic Prices and SS = Standardized structure) are additive and are based on price structures which are characteristic for all countries. One may not necessarily want similarity with countries exhibiting high variances due to errors but this different topic. Present analysis bases on the official ICP data (validated and approved). Obviously, these data is not ideal (and problematic points are known) but for a more adequate analysis it is necessary, firstly, to eliminate errors and solve problematic points in the official calculations.

<sup>4</sup> BH data from the Global 2017 ICP for 143 countries participating in the Global linking were included.

**Table 1:**

**Average absolute % difference: PPPs by additive methods vs official EKS-PPPs with fixity (W143=1)**

	Abs % difference	Abs % difference	Abs % difference	Abs % difference	Abs % difference	Abs % difference
	Gerardi	SS	Ikle	GK	MPCP	EKS / EKS fix
<b>GDP-Av</b>	2.9	3.0	2.9	4.0	2.8	1.2
<b>GDP-Max</b>	21.3	19.8	23.9	24.2	19.5	7.8
<b>DA-Av</b>	2.9	3.0	2.6	3.5	2.5	1.0
<b>DA-Max</b>	17.8	16.9	14.3	23.5	19.7	8.0
<b>HHd-Av</b>	2.7	2.8	2.4	3.5	2.6	1.2
<b>HHd-Max</b>	19.2	23.5	16.4	27.5	14.2	7.9

Table 1 shows that the average absolute differences of PPPs (W143=1 / unweighted GM scaling) by any additive method and official Global EKS-PPPs with Regional fixity are rather moderate but the differences for individual countries can be very high.

### **What additive methods is preferable from the point of view of structural analysis?**

**The G-K** is a very attractive additive which can be interpreted in clear economic terms. However, the G-K was replaced by the EKS method after "Great debates" (1988-1989) because of potential Gerschenkron effect (the gravitation of international average prices to prices of large or more developed countries and respectively to the overestimation of volumes for less developed countries). This point was discussed in details on the basis of the ICP 2011 / 2017 data during the recent TAG virtual meeting:

<https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/8df7ba7d75d1fe02610e0c88449cb8e8-0050022021/original/2-02-RA-Item-05-The-Gerschenkron-effect-in-ICP-2011-and-ICP-2017-Dikhanov-2.pdf>

<https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/48818fe7861193e612d314d50456bd56-0050022021/original/2-02-RA-Item-05-The-Gerschenkron-effect-in-ICP-2011-and-ICP-2017-Sergeev-Comment-2.pdf>

The paper prepared by Y. Dikhanov examined the Gerschenkron effect on the ICP 2011 and ICP 2017 data by the comparison of the results obtained by the official "unbiased" Gini-Éltető-Köves-Szulc (GEKS) ICP approach with the results using two additive approaches based on average international prices: the Geary-Khamis (GK) and Ikle-Dikhanov-Balk (IDB). It was found that, when contrasted to earlier ICP exercises, the Gerschenkron effect was significantly weaker in 2011 and 2017 in the case of the GK, and in the case of the IDB index it was not easily identifiable. The following main reasons were indicated (p. 5): "... *China and India are now influencing the GK international price vector much more so one can reasonably expect that the Gerschenkron effect would diminish. Convergence of price structures around the world through expansion of international trade and globalization processes would be another consideration that could diminish the effect. And finally, an important factor in reduction of the Gerschenkron effect was the adoption of productivity adjustment for government services in the ICP starting in 2005*".

The degree of the Gerschenkron effect on aggregated PPPs depends on similarity of country's price structure with international prices and also on similarity of country's expenditure structure (shares). Therefore, it is desirable to measure the deviations of the country's price structures from a reference price structure as well as the differences of national price structures. It is possible to use for this purpose the coefficients of similarity of price structures<sup>5</sup>. These

<sup>5</sup> S. Sergeev "Measures of the inter-country price similarities and their practical application in international comparisons" - A paper for the UN ECE Consultation on the ECP (Geneva, 12.11 – 14.11.2001). This paper contains also the description of the coefficients of similarity of national GDP expenditure structures (expenditure shares).

indicators are between 0 and 1 like the correlation coefficients (with many other similar properties): the values which are closer to 1 show higher similarity. The author of this notice calculated the coefficients of similarity of national price and expenditure structures "Each country with Each country" for the GDP and HH (domestic) for the 143 countries participating in the Global linking of the ICP 2017<sup>6</sup>.

The calculations showed that GK prices gravitate more to the price structures of the EU-OECD and LA countries. However, the ICP 2017 data did not confirm the statement that the G-K prices gravitate to the price structure of the large countries. Not USA or CHN have the highest similarity of price structures with the G-K average prices<sup>7</sup> but rather small countries or the countries with the middle level of economic development: CYP, ESP, EST, GRC, SVN, HKG, PER - see Table 2 below:

**Table 2** Ten highest coefficients of similarity of price structures (national with G-K international)

<b>GDP: 10 highest coefficients of similarity of price structures (national with GK international prices)</b>							
	<b>GK</b>	<b>IkIe</b>	<b>CPD-Rao</b>	<b>ShGK-Rao</b>	<b>SS Str</b>	<b>MPCP</b>	<b>Gerardi</b>
<b>CYP</b>	<b>0.9095</b>	0.8170	0.8510	0.8686	0.8725	0.8023	0.8514
<b>ESP</b>	<b>0.8987</b>	0.7901	0.8302	0.8487	0.8442	0.7493	0.8208
<b>EST</b>	<b>0.9081</b>	0.8629	0.8920	0.8994	0.9078	0.8116	0.8971
<b>GRC</b>	<b>0.9226</b>	0.8814	0.9028	0.9095	0.9161	0.8551	0.9049
<b>PRT</b>	<b>0.8921</b>	0.8397	0.8816	0.8994	0.8985	0.7752	0.8745
<b>SVK</b>	<b>0.8868</b>	0.8655	0.8883	0.8915	0.8964	0.7901	0.8889
<b>SVN</b>	<b>0.8994</b>	0.8328	0.8692	0.8826	0.8898	0.7822	0.8702
<b>HKG</b>	<b>0.8971</b>	0.7966	0.8188	0.8329	0.8289	0.8234	0.8141
<b>PER</b>	<b>0.8944</b>	0.8928	0.9152	0.9264	0.9278	0.8649	0.9165
<b>HH (d): 10 highest coefficients of similarity of price structures (national with GK international prices)</b>							
	<b>GK</b>	<b>IkIe</b>	<b>CPD-Rao</b>	<b>ShGK-Rao</b>	<b>SS Str</b>	<b>MPCP</b>	<b>Gerardi</b>
<b>CHL</b>	<b>0.9232</b>	0.8627	0.8808	0.8789	0.8591	0.7768	0.8538
<b>CRI</b>	<b>0.8950</b>	0.8922	0.9044	0.9018	0.8991	0.8318	0.8982
<b>CYP</b>	<b>0.8965</b>	0.8384	0.8760	0.8873	0.8901	0.7566	0.8742
<b>EST</b>	<b>0.8964</b>	0.8285	0.8641	0.8723	0.8843	0.7605	0.8722
<b>GRC</b>	<b>0.9006</b>	0.8852	0.9051	0.9039	0.9154	0.8070	0.9104
<b>ITA</b>	<b>0.8823</b>	0.7899	0.8191	0.8263	0.8297	0.7317	0.8171
<b>LVA</b>	<b>0.9052</b>	0.8637	0.8923	0.8963	0.9047	0.7843	0.8965
<b>SVK</b>	<b>0.8881</b>	0.8283	0.8590	0.8614	0.8678	0.7393	0.8606
<b>HKG</b>	<b>0.8913</b>	0.8368	0.8538	0.8649	0.8460	0.8017	0.8344

The potential GK bias due to the gravitation of average prices to prices of large countries then this is rather not drawback of the method but its advantage because these prices can be justified economically (the world prices gravitate generally to the prices of main producers). Of course, to do this statement one should be sure that the BH-PPPs reflect properly actual quality differences in the products. Additionally, not the size of the countries is the main factor, which has the highest impact on the the G-K results but the similarity of price structures. For example, economically USA and Canada have very different size but price structures are very similar and the results "USA - Canada" are very similar by any aggregation method.

<sup>6</sup> Detailed coefficients are contained in the EXCEL file which is available by the WB ICP unit. Low coefficients of inter-country similarity of national price structures reflect in some cases actual national peculiarities in prices but in many cases - the weakness of BH-PPPs due to insufficient Quality (consumer products) and Productivity adjustments (non-market services) as well as very different approaches used by the EU-OECD and other ICP Regions for many important areas (Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction).

<sup>7</sup> Of course, USA and China have significant impact on the GK prices. However international GK prices gravitate more to the price structures of relatively small countries with middle level of economic development. Similarity of structure international GK prices with price structures of US (0.787) and China (0.853) is high but not the highest.

The analysis of the BH-PPPs input data shows that the main actual reason for the Gerschenkron effect is not a theoretical drawback of the GK method *per se* but the weakness of BH-PPPs due to insufficient Quality (Consumer products, Construction) and Productivity adjustments (Non-market services) as well as very different approaches used by the EU-OECD and other ICP Regions for many important areas (Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction). If Quality and Productivity adjustments are done properly and the regional methods for Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction are more unified then one should expect that all aggregation methods will produce similar results. For example, the PPPs of the most of the EU-OECD countries calculated by the official EKS and other methods based on the use of average international prices vary in a very moderate degree.

**Main disadvantage of the GK as well as of all additive methods based on the simultaneous calculation of PPPs and international average prices is not the potential Gerschenkron effect but the fact that these methods are not sectoral independent:** the additivity is achieved if all aggregates compared within the GDP framework. In effect, it is impossible to have independent results for separate aggregates HH, GFCF, etc. because the PPPs for the aggregates are depended on the whole set of data for GDP. For example, international G-K prices for “Food” depend on the GDP-PPPs and therefore on prices for “Construction”, etc.

The sectoral dependency is especially problematic for the use of GK in the structural analysis. We want to analyse the price and volume structure at the detailed disaggregated levels but all national prices are recalculated to a common level by the same (high aggregated) PPPs for GDP? Probably, R.Geary proposed his method with the aim to obtain the PPPs for the whole aggregate - What would be the GDP-PPPs if they are obtained from national prices recalculated to a common price level with these GDP-PPPs? In this case, international prices for products (recalculated by GDP-PPPs) are *per se* not exact but they produce correct average GDP-PPPs.

## **IDB method**

IDB method is based on the average international prices obtaining from national prices as Harmonic Mean with country's expenditure weights. The IDB method is equivalent to the GK method when all the countries have the same size in terms of real GDP. i.e. the IDB prices are not affected by the sizes of individual countries. Therefore IDB results do not have a systematic Gerschenkron effect.

However the results by IDB method are also sectoral dependent and even more than the GK results. D.Ikle used the same assumption as R.Geary for the PPPs but introduced a similar assumption also for the Volume indices - What would be the GDP-PPPs if they are obtained from national prices recalculated to a common price level with these GDP-PPPs and the national quantities recalculated to a common level with the GDP Volume indices<sup>8</sup>? So, the double sectoral dependency of the IDB results is problematic for the use of IDB results for the structural analysis.

---

<sup>8</sup> These double recalculation of prices and quantities to common levels leads to the use of Harmonic mean with country's expenditure weighs during the calculation of average international prices.

## Gerardi method<sup>9</sup>

The Gerardi UCW (Unit Country weight) method was used in the Eurostat PPP comparison of Year 1975. The Gerardi method is based on the average international prices obtaining from national prices as unweighted GM without the use of PPPs. The PPPs are not necessary because the Gerardi method is based actually on the averaging of national price ratios (the ratios of prices between the products - price structures) but not on the averaging of the national prices. The price ratios are dimensionless and therefore directly comparable. So, if one wants to have additive results which are sectoral independent (like the GEKS results) then the Gerardi UCW method has an obvious preference.

In the actual PPP exercises with the use of BH data where BH-PPPs are used as quasi-prices the Gerardi results are obtained in the following way:

- a) Initial BH-PPPs (Base country =1) are scaled to the base (Region or World = 1) as the ratios to their GM (unweighted). These rescaled BH-PPP can be presented in more understandable form with additional scaling: Product of PPPs = Product of reference XRs (e.g. Euro or USD). For example, Eurostat uses such scaling to Euro – this artificial unit was named as PPS = Purchasing Power Standard
- b) Real Values for BHs are obtained as “Nominal BH value in National currency / Scaled BH-PPP”.
- c) The RV from b) are additive. Therefore, the RV for any aggregated heading (AH) can be obtained as a simple sum of RV of respective BHs. PPPs for any aggregated heading are obtained as the ratios “Nominal AH value in National currency / Real Value of AH”

The Gerardi results are PPP are additive, invariant, transitive and sectoral independent. So, the Gerardi method seems to be preferable for the structural analysis. The simplicity of Gerardi method is not an obvious drawback (and, maybe, even advantage). The fact that Gerardi international prices are unweighted GM of individual country prices is not a clear drawback. Binary F-PPP is based on unweighted arithmetic mean of prices of two countries and, nevertheless, F-PPP is a superlative index, IDB prices are calculated by the assumption that all the countries have the same size in terms of real GDP.

## 2) Additivity and Fixity of regional results

There is even more important point concerning the additive results:

- if one wants to use the regional fixity also in the Global GK, IDB, G aggregations then this will distort the additivity in any case,
- if one produces the free Global results by GK, IDB, G then these results will be additive and formally inter-regionally comparable but inconsistent with the regional results. The differences can be very high for many important areas (Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction) due to different approaches used by the EU-OECD and other ICP Regions. This can lead to numerous question and irritations – What results are more reliable?

Let us look on the OECD experience with the producing and publishing of additive results as the supplement to the official GEKS results.

---

<sup>9</sup>D.Gerardi “Selected problems of inter-country comparisons on the basis of the experience of the EEC”, Review of Income and Wealth. Volume 28, Issue 4:

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1475-4991.1982.tb00624.x>

### 3) Experience from the OECD with the publishing of two sets of the results (EKS and GK)

Following decision done during the “Great debates “ (1988-1989), the OECD started to produce and publish from the 1990 exercise two sets of the PPP results: official EKS results for volume and price level inter-country comparisons and non-official results by the GK method for structural analyse – see, for example, the link to the 1990 GK results below:

[PPP1990.pdf \(worldbank.org\)](#)

The comprehensive sets of the GK results (without fixity for EU countries) were published for 1990 and 1993 exercises<sup>10</sup>. However, the GK results were practically not used and additionally there were numerous irritations with the explanation of double results. Therefore, the OECD publishes in the 1996, 1999 and 2002 exercises only two Tables with the GK results: relative PLI and Volume indices (with double base: OECD = 100 and GDP=100), to avoid the irritation with the official Comparative PLI and Volume indices by the EKS approach. However, this did not help. The GK results were practically not used (only the irritations) and the OECD stopped the production and the publication of the GK results.

So, the OECD long-term experience with the production of two sets of the results (GEKS and GK) shows that the production and the publication of two sets of the ICP results (GEKS and by an additive method) is rather problematic. **MINUTES OF THE ICP TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP** (May 17-19, 2021 (Virtual meeting) say on page 5: “*Regarding the option to release multiple sets of PPPs, based on different methods, the TAG reaffirmed concerns on user reception, given that understanding the differences require a good understanding of PPP estimation methodology.*”

More general point concerning the presence of two different sets of the ICP results: one official for volume and price level inter-country comparisons and another non-official - by an additive method for structural analyse. It seems that it is very problematic to carry out the comprehensive consistent analysis if different (but connected) indicators are calculated by different methods: PPPs and Real values as well as Volume indices are obtained by the EKS method but Relative Volume and Relative Price indices should be based on the PPPs and Real values obtained by the GK or an other additive method. In this aspect - **Is it possible to use the official EKS results also for the structural analyses?** The author of this notice believes that "Yes" (of course, with the reservations) if the official EKS results are presented in an adequate form.

### 4) Flexible non-additivity of the EKS results and potential use of the official EKS results for structural analysis

The degree of non-additivity of the EKS Real values (percentage differences between Real Values for an Aggregate-Total and the sum of its elements) depends on the currency numeraire used. If a base country currency is used then the degree of non-additivity of the EKS Real values depend of the variation of PPPs for underlying headings and the variation of respective expenditure shares. Generally, one can say that Real values reflect in this case price structure of the base country. On other, side the use of a neutral invariant base can reduce non-additivity drastically.

Let us to illustrate this on one extreme non-additive case occurred in the ADB ICP 2017 exercise for the GFCF. ADB used traditionally HKD as numeraire and the percentage differences between Real Values for GFCF-Total and the sum of its elements in HKD are

---

<sup>10</sup> The PPPs and Volumes were presented with the neutral basis “OECD=100” and the scaling “Sum of RV by PPPs to USD = Sum of RV by XRs to USD” was done. So, the results were presented with an artificial unit “OECD-\$”.

varied from -14% till +38%. HKG has very high price level for "Construction" and "normal" for "Machinery and equipment" (MEQ) relatively other ADB countries. In effect, the PPPs "Country / HKG" for MEQ are 2-3-4 times higher than for Construction. Respectively, the degree of non-additivity of the EKS Real values is very high.

If one selects CHN currency as numeraire then the degree of non-additivity of the EKS Real values is not so high and if one selects IND currency as numeraire then the degree of non-additivity of the EKS Real values is rather moderate because PPPs "Country / CNH" and "Country / IND" have no such drastic differences as PPPs "Country / HKG".

Generally, an "average" neutral regional currency would be desirable for the presentation of the EKS Real values (RV) to have rather moderate degree of non-additivity. What "average" neutral regional currency is recommendable?

The ADB official PPPs to HKD can be scaled to a neutral "average" Asian HKD in two ways:

- a) **Scaling with expenditure weights** - like it is used by the EU-OECD for the presentation of official aggregated PPP/PLIs or by the WB by the presentation of the PLI with the base "Word = 100" (Sum of RV by PPPs = Sum of RV by XRs).
- b) **Scaling without expenditure weights** - like it is used by the EU-OECD for the presentation of PPP/PLIs in the QTs (Product of PPPs = Product of reference XRs).

Both approaches decrease the degree of non-additivity but the effect of big countries is not eliminated fully by the approach a). Therefore, it is recommendable to use the approach b). The approach b) can be used for any Regional or Global set of EKS-PPPs to obtain the RV in a neutral "average" Regional or Global currency with moderate degree of non-additivity. The Summary of the experiments with the ADB 2017 GFCF data are presented in **Table 3**:

**Table 3:**  
**Summary of the experiments for the evaluation of non-additivity of the ADB 2017 results for GFCF by different presentation of the PPPs**

ADB ICP 2017																									
Gross Fixed Capital Formation (GFCF) - analysis of thr choice of base currency on the non-additivity EKS Real Values																									
ADB22 2017: Real expenditure data (mio. HKD)																									
	Max	Min	Max-Min	BGD	BRN	BTN	CHN	FJI	HKG	IDN	IND	KHM	LAO	LKA	MDV	MMR	MNG	MYS	NPL	PAK	PHL	SGP	THA	TWN	VNM
Nod-add (%) = (Sum-T/GFCF-1)*100	37.6	-13.9	51.6	33.7	14.1	32.2	13.6	-13.9	0.0	37.6	7.0	13.4	4.9	0.7	14.7	8.9	0.2	12.7	12.3	-0.2	3.4	-9.1	-8.7	-11.2	26.8
ADB22 2017: Real expenditure data (mio. CHN)																									
	Max	Min	Max-Min	BGD	BRN	BTN	CHN	FJI	HKG	IDN	IND	KHM	LAO	LKA	MDV	MMR	MNG	MYS	NPL	PAK	PHL	SGP	THA	TWN	VNM
Nod-add (%) = (Sum-T/GFCF-1)*100	12.6	-9.0	21.5	10.9	1.2	10.4	0.0	-9.0	-1.6	12.6	-1.6	1.1	-2.9	-4.3	1.6	-0.8	-4.5	0.6	0.2	-4.6	-3.0	-5.0	-8.3	-6.4	6.6
ADB22 2017: Real expenditure data (mio. IND)																									
	Max	Min	Max-Min	BGD	BRN	BTN	CHN	FJI	HKG	IDN	IND	KHM	LAO	LKA	MDV	MMR	MNG	MYS	NPL	PAK	PHL	SGP	THA	TWN	VNM
Nod-add (%) = (Sum-T/GFCF-1)*100	5.4	-1.9	7.3	3.4	0.1	3.5	-1.9	2.5	5.3	3.4	0.0	0.7	-0.9	0.1	0.4	0.2	-0.2	-0.1	-0.7	-0.2	0.1	5.4	-0.3	4.6	0.5
ADB22 2017: Real expenditure data (mio. Asian HKD-W)																									
	Max	Min	Max-Min	BGD	BRN	BTN	CHN	FJI	HKG	IDN	IND	KHM	LAO	LKA	MDV	MMR	MNG	MYS	NPL	PAK	PHL	SGP	THA	TWN	VNM
Nod-add (%) = (Sum-T/GFCF-1)*100	10.3	-6.7	16.9	8.9	0.7	8.6	-0.6	-6.6	-0.2	10.3	-1.4	0.8	-2.5	-3.5	1.0	-0.8	-3.6	0.3	-0.1	-3.7	-2.5	-2.6	-6.7	-3.9	5.0
ADB22 2017: Real expenditure data (mio. Asian HKD-Unw)																									
	Max	Min	Max-Min	BGD	BRN	BTN	CHN	FJI	HKG	IDN	IND	KHM	LAO	LKA	MDV	MMR	MNG	MYS	NPL	PAK	PHL	SGP	THA	TWN	VNM
Nod-add (%) = (Sum-T/GFCF-1)*100	5.3	-1.3	6.6	4.2	0.4	4.4	-1.3	1.6	5.0	4.6	0.4	0.9	-0.4	-0.2	0.7	0.4	-0.1	0.4	-0.1	-0.1	0.2	5.3	-0.8	4.3	1.3

More drastic situation for the GFCF was in the Global ICP 2017. The Real Values in the Global ICP 2017 were presented in USD. Many countries have for “Machinery and Equipment” and “Construction” very different PPPs to USD as well as expenditure structure. In effect, the non-additivity of the RV for the GFCF is aggregate was extreme. For example, IDN RV for GFCF was **846** mio. USD but alone Construction had RV of **1617** mio. USD. It is very difficult to explain to users such results. Non-experienced users can considered these as mistakes or misprints.

The author of this notice rescaled the official Global EKS PPPs for the 143 countries participating in the Global Linking ICP 2017 to neutral basis “World143 = 1” with the scaling “Product of PPPs to USD = Product of XRs to USD” – this unit can be named as “World \$”.<sup>11</sup> The degree of non-additivity were calculated as “Percentage absolute deviation: GFCF-Total vs Sum of 3 categories”. The same indicators were calculated for the RV in USD as well as for the RVs obtained by the Gerardi method. Detailed Tables for Global ICP 2017 for GFCF are presented in Annex 1. Average as well as maximal values of the degree of non-additivity for the Regions are presented in Table 4:

**Table 4: ICP 2017**  
**Average percentage absolute deviations: GFCF-Total vs Sum of 3 categories**

	EUO	AFR	ASI	LA	WA	W143
by PPPs scaled by GM-XRs to World = 1	6.9	3.9	4.8	2.3	2.5	4.8
by PPPs to USD	14.0	34.8	44.0	44.1	47.0	30.7
by scaled BH-PPPs (Gerardi)	7.6	4.4	5.5	2.9	4.4	5.5

**Maximal percentage devitaions: GFCF-Total vs Sum of 3 categories**

	EUO	AFR	ASI	LA	WA	W143
by PPPs scaled by GM-XRs to World = 1	26.8	15.8	15.8	9.2	7.0	26.8
	(USA)	(AGO)	(IDN)	(HTI)	(OMN)	(USA)
by PPPs to USD	54.4	98.9	100.4	108.1	75.7	108.1
	(ALB)	(ETH)	(IDN)	(HTI)	(OMN)	(HTI)
by scaled BH-PPPs ( Gerardi)	26.8	17.7	16.0	9.6	10.1	26.8
	(CHE)	(AGO)	(IDN)	(HTI)	(OMN)	(CHE)

Table 4 shows that the presentation in USD brings systematic extreme non-additivity if underlying PPPs and expenditure shares are very different. Average percentage absolute deviations for the GFCF are very high for all Regions because the PPPs for “Construction” (USA=1) are very high relatively PPPs for “Machinery and Equipment”. On other side, the scaling of official Global EKS-PPPs to the base “World143 =1” brings systematically very moderate degree of non-additivity: 3-5%. Such degrees of non-additivity (3-5%) are sufficient for the reliable structural analysis in the practice. The use of the Gerardi approach with scaling of original BH-PPPs brings very similar degrees of non-additivity.

The considerations above did not say that the use of neutral Regional or World numeraire eliminates non-additivity but they demonstrate on an extreme example that this approach reduce non-additivity drastically with the degree which is sufficient for reliable structural analysis. Of course, if data for some countries contains extreme differences like by IDN for GFCF then the degree of non-additivity can be still remarkable – see the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of Table 4 with maximal values for the countries within the Regions - but nevertheless not extreme: e.g.,

<sup>11</sup> World or Regional “average” numeraires are not easily understood but the same refers to the GK or IDB dollars used in the ICP or PPS used by Eurostat.



IDN – 100% by the use of RV in USD and only 16% by the use of scaled EKS-PPPs for the calculation of RV in the World numeraire.

USA 2017 PPPs for “Construction” obtained by the Eurostat-OECD approach (BoQ) and the ICP approach (ICA) were also very different and this is the main factor for high non-additivity of RV in USD. So, maybe, it is more desirable to focus the efforts on the improvement and unification of the methods used by the Regions for several important areas (Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction) which can bring quasi-additive results than on the production and the publishing of an alternative set of the results.

Obviously, as the Minutes of the recent TAG meeting / VC say, the researchers should have a possibility to produce the ICP results by use of alternative estimation methods and approaches for own analyses and be responsible for these results. However, it is not desirable to produce and publish officially an alternative set of the ICP results. It is better to inform users that non-additivity of the EKS results is relative and the degree of non-additivity depends on the presentation of PPPs and Volumes. Different scaling of official published EKS-PPPs and Volumes can be helpful for the purposes of the different analyses. For example, Eurostat PPP Database contains unweighted and weighted (by exp.) PPPs with the following bases: EU37, EU27\_2019, EU27, EU25, EU15:

<http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/purchasing-power-parities/data/database>

GEO	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
European Union - 27 countries	8,440,087	8,664,530	8,700,067	8,955,203	9,379,688
European Union - 28 countries	9,860,999	10,145,460	10,198,195	10,504,517	11,004,675
European Union - 27 countries	9,810,747	10,093,487	10,145,586	10,451,564	10,949,291
European Union - 25 countries	9,534,872	9,800,515	9,854,983	10,144,209	10,618,564
European Union - 15 countries	8,507,977	8,726,348	8,772,017	9,020,534	9,430,123
Euro area - 19 countries (from 2011)	6,959,232	7,115,190	7,153,431	7,344,565	7,672,199
Euro area - 18 countries (2011)	6,917,349	7,070,680	7,106,754	7,295,363	7,620,183
Euro area - 17 countries (2011)	6,894,421	7,045,881	7,080,731	7,268,833	7,592,146
Euro area - 16 countries (2011)	6,878,242	7,028,429	7,062,704	7,249,928	7,571,936
Euro area - 15 countries (2011)	6,803,328	6,948,125	6,981,737	7,167,269	7,485,230
Euro area - 13 countries (2011)	6,778,150	6,924,698	6,959,132	7,144,109	7,460,906
Euro area - 12 countries (2011)	6,745,628	6,891,616	6,926,859	7,111,205	7,426,727
Euro area - 11 countries (1999)	6,560,840	6,713,008	6,752,498	6,933,808	7,245,839
Belgium	238,733	250,103	257,984	267,462	280,649

**Unit of measure** [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/prc\\_ppp\\_esms.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/cache/metadata/en/prc_ppp_esms.htm)

PPPs can be interpreted as the exchange rates of countries' national currencies against the PPS. They express the number of currency units per PPS.

Real expenditures are expenditures in national currency converted to PPS using PPPs. They are thus denominated in PPS.

**PLIs and volume indices per capita are indices that, in Eurostat's database, use EU27\_2019, EU28, EU27 and EU15 as "base country" (EU27\_2019=100, EU28=100, EU27=100 and EU15=100 and depending on the user's choice).**

## 5) Treatment of Negative expenditure

One additional specific point which should be considered for the PPP methods as well as for the structural analysis. All PPP methods are based on the assumption that price data contains only positive values and expenditure / quantity data – only non-negative values. This is not so in the practice. GDP contains several BHs where negative expenditure can occur. So, the category “Net exports” has very significant negative value in many countries (in some extreme cases, the share of “Net exports” in GDP is minus 30-50%). Additive aggregation methods based on the simultaneous calculation of PPPs and international average prices<sup>12</sup> like the GK or the IDB can be very sensitive to use of negative expenditure values. Distorting effect can be significant. For example, recent version of the PWT10.1 contains several cases where GK GDP-PPPs are negative. Of course, such cases with negative PPPs are rather very rare exceptions but, in any case, negative expenditure bring distorting effect. The size of distortions depends on the aggregation method per se and the size (shares) of negative expenditure as well as the variation of underlying BH-PPP/PLIs.

The EKS method is less sensitive to the presence of negative expenditure. Nevertheless, if the shares of negative expenditure are very high and BH-PPP/PLIs are very different then the bilateral F-PPPs can be not very reliable because of very high difference between L- and P-PPPs. The Table 5 below contains several simplified examples from the Global ICP 2017 of the calculations of the F-PPPs where the countries have very high negative share of “Net exports” or / and very different PLIs for Domestic Absorption (DA), to demonstrate possible distorting effect of the inclusion of the categories with negative expenditure in the PPP calculations.

### **One example: F-PPP between STP and LUX**

STP has very high negative “Net export” (~ - 50%) and very low PLI for DA = ~ 46% (LUX=100). In effect, Paasche-PLI for STP (LUX =100) was outside the PLI for underlying categories. Similar situation is with the calculation of F-PPPs between NPL and CHE.

### **Second example: F-PPP between SDN and CHE**

SDN has moderate share of negative “Net export” (~ - 6%) but SDN has very low PLI for DA = ~ 20% (SHE=100). In effect, Paasche-PLI for SDN (CHE =100) was outside the PLI for underlying categories even the share of negative expenditure is relatively small.

### **Third example: F-PPP between STP and LSO**

Both countries have high share of negative “Net export” (~ - 50% and ~ - 40%), PLI between these countries is close to 100%. In effect, Laspeyres, Paasche and Fisher PLIs for STP (LSO =100) were higher than the PLI for underlying categories.

---

<sup>12</sup> Distorting effect by the use of additive aggregation methods based on the simultaneous calculation of PPPs and international average prices (like GK or IDB) refers to all analytical categories (but in different degree). Gerardi method is generally more robust to the presence of negative expenditure because this method is sectoral independent. Distorting effect here refers only to the analytical categories containing BHs with negative expenditure.

**Table 5: Several F-PLI examples from ICP 2017**

Calculation of bilateral F-PLI from DA and Net exports						
<b>ICP143 Global multilateral results</b>						
		A	B	A	B	(A+B)/2
		STP	LUX	STP	LUX	T-Sh
	PLI A/B (B=100)	Sh Exp A (%)	Sh Exp B (%)	PLI A (W=100)	PLI B (W=100)	
DA	45.8	150.7	64.8	68.7	150.1	1.078
Net exports	100.0	-50.7	35.2	100.0	100.0	-0.078
GDP	50.0	100.0	100.0	67.1	134.2	1.000
<b>Bilateral F-PLI from DA and Net exports</b>						
L-PLI STP/LUX (LUX=100)		64.9				
P-PLI STP/LUX (LUX=100)		35.9				
F-PLI STP/LUX (LUX=100)		48.3				
T-PLI STP/LUX (LUX=100)		43.1				
<b>ICP143 Global multilateral results</b>						
		A	B	A	B	(A+B)/2
		SDN	CHE	SDN	CHE	T-Sh
	PLI A/B (B=100)	Sh Exp A (%)	Sh Exp B (%)	PLI A (W=100)	PLI B (W=100)	
DA	19.7	106.0	89.4	34.8	176.5	0.977
Net exports	100.0	-6.0	10.6	100.0	100.0	0.023
GDP	20.0	100.0	100.0	33.8	169.0	1.000
<b>Bilateral F-PLI from DA and Net exports</b>						
L-PLI SDN/CHE (CHE=100)		28.2				
P-PLI SDN/CHE (CHE=100)		18.8				
F-PLI SDN/CHE (CHE=100)		23.0				
T-PLI SDN/CHE (CHE=100)		20.5				
<b>ICP143 Global multilateral results</b>						
		A	B	A	B	(A+B)/2
		NPL	CHE	NPL	CHE	T-Sh
	PLI A/B (B=100)	Sh Exp A (%)	Sh Exp B (%)	PLI A (W=100)	PLI B (W=100)	
DA	26.2	133.8	89.4	46.2	176.5	1.116
Net exports	100.0	-33.8	10.6	100.0	100.0	-0.116
GDP	25.3	100.0	100.0	42.8	169.0	1.000
<b>Bilateral F-PLI from DA and Net exports</b>						
L-PLI NPL/CHE (CHE=100)		34.0				
P-PLI NPL/CHE (CHE=100)		20.9				
F-PLI NPL/CHE (CHE=100)		26.7				
T-PLI NPL/CHE (CHE=100)		22.4				
<b>ICP143 Global multilateral results</b>						
		A	B	A	B	(A+B)/2
		STP	LSO	STP	LSO	T-Sh
	PLI A/B (B=100)	Sh Exp A (%)	Sh Exp B (%)	PLI A (W=100)	PLI B (W=100)	
DA	110.3	150.7	141.6	68.7	62.3	1.462
Net exports	100.0	-50.7	-41.6	100.0	100.0	-0.462
GDP	112.6	100.0	100.0	67.1	59.6	1.000
<b>Bilateral F-PLI from DA and Net exports</b>						
L-PLI STP/LSO (LSO=100)		114.5				
P-PLI STP/LSO (LSO=100)		116.3				
F-PLI STP/LSO (LSO=100)		115.4				
T-PLI STP/LSO (LSO=100)		115.4				

The presence of negative expenditure brings also the problems for the structural analysis. For example, when A.Heston and P.Rao examined in their paper<sup>13</sup> evolution of economic structures of countries in terms of price and quantity similarity and the global price structures then they excluded all BHs with negative expenditure during the calculation of coefficients of price similarity and all BHs where some countries have zero or negative expenditure during the calculation of coefficients of quantity similarity. Obviously, simple exclusion of some data is not the actual solution of the problem. Further investigations on this topic are desirable.

## Conclusions

- 1) The results by an additive method would be the most appropriate for structural analysis. The Gerardi method can be considered as the most appropriate as sectoral independent. The GK and the IDB methods are less appropriate due to sectoral dependency of the results.

<sup>13</sup> <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/f60d81b4360769d233c638017e5a5c6b-0050022021/original/1-02-Understanding-the-World-Economy-Insights-from-ICP-2017-Heston-and-Rao.pdf>

- 2) However if one wants to use the regional fixity also in the Global GK, IDB or G aggregations then the attempt to keep fixity will distort the additivity in any case. If one produces the free Global results by GK, IDB or G methods then these results will be additive and formally inter-regionally comparable but inconsistent with the regional results. The differences can be very high for many important areas (Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction) due to different approaches used by the EU-OECD and other ICP Regions. This can lead to numerous question and irritations – What results are more reliable?
- 3) Additive results produced and published as a supplement to the official GEKS results would be non-official and therefore it is very likely that they will not be broadly used and if they are used then can be numerous irritations. The OECD long-term experience with the production and publishing of two sets of the results (GEKS and GK) shows that the understanding of two sets of the ICP results (GEKS and by an additive method) is rather problematic for users. In effect, the OECD stopped to produce and publish GK results.
- 4) Generally, it is very problematic to carry out the comprehensive consistent analysis if different (but connected) indicators are calculated by different methods: PPPs and Real values as well as Volume indices are obtained by the EKS method but Relative Volume and Relative Price indices should be based on the PPPs and Real values obtained by the GK or an other additive method.
- 5) The non-additivity of the official EKS results (with Regional fixity) can be significantly reduced if the official EKS PPPs using for the calculation of Real Values are presented in a “neutral” form with the base “Region or World = 1” (unweighted GM scaling is preferable). So, the scaling of official Global ICP 2017 EKS-PPPs to the base “World143 =1” brings systematically very moderate degree of non-additivity: 2-5%. Such degrees of non-additivity (2-5%) are sufficient for the reliable structural analysis in the practice.
- 6) The analysis shows that the main actual reason high non-additivity is not the EKS method *per se* but the weakness of BH-PPPs due to insufficient Quality (Consumer products, Construction) and Productivity adjustments (Non-market services) as well as very different approaches used by the EU-OECD and other ICP Regions for many important areas (Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction). It is more desirable to focus the efforts on the improvement and unification of the methods used by the Regions for several important areas (Housing rents, Education, Health, Construction) which can bring quasi-additive results than on the production and the publishing of an alternative set of the results.
- 7) The researchers should have a possibility to produce the ICP results by use of alternative estimation methods and approaches for own analyses and be responsible for these results. However, it is not desirable to produce and publish officially an alternative set of the ICP results. It is better to inform users that non-additivity of the EKS results is relative and the degree of non-additivity depends on the presentation of PPPs and Volumes. Different scaling of official published EKS-PPPs and Volumes can be helpful for the purposes of the different analyses.
- 8) Presence of BHs with negative expenditure introduces distorting effect in the PPP calculations as well as in the structural analysis. The investigations on special treatment of negative expenditure in the aggregation procedures and the structural analysis are desirable.

## Annex 1: Global ICP 2017: Average percentage absolute deviations: GFCF-Total vs Sum of 3 categories

ICP 2017 (Global)		Real values (mio.USD-W)																																																
		USA	ALB	AUS	AUT	BEL	BGR	BIH	CAN	CHE	CHL	COL	CRI	CYP	CZE	DEU	DNK	ESP	EST	FIN	FRA	GBR	GRC	HRV	HUN	IRL	ISL	ISR	ITA	JPN	KOR	LTU	LUX	LVA	MEX	MKD	MLT	MNE	NLD	NOR	NZL	POL	PRT	ROU	RUS	SRB	SVK	SVN	SWE	TUR
Gerardi RV	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
		% Diff G-RV / scaled EKS-RV																																																
		Calculation by EKS-PPPs scaled to ICP143 by YRs																																																
RV-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
PPP-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
NV	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
RV-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																																
PPP-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																																
NV	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																																
RV-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																																
PPP-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																																
NV	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																																
RV-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																																
PPP-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																																
NV	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																																
RV as Sum	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
		% Difference (RV by scaled EKS-PPP Total=100)																																																
	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
		Calculation by EKS-PPPs to USD																																																
RV-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
PPP-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
NV	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
RV-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																																
PPP-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																																
NV	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																																
RV-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																																
PPP-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																																
NV	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																																
RV-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																																
PPP-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																																
NV	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																																
RV as Sum	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																
		% Difference (RV by EKS-PPP to USD Total=100)																																																
	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																																



## Annex 1: Global ICP 2017: Average percentage absolute deviations: GFCF-Total vs Sum of 3 categories (cont.)

ICP 2017 (Global)		Real values (mio.USD-M)																																											
		BGD	BRN	BTN	CHN	FJI	HKG	IDN	IND	KHM	LAO	LKA	MDV	MMR	MNG	MYS	NPL	PAK	PHL	SGP	THA	TWN	VNM	ARG	BOL	BRA	DOM	ECU	HND	HTI	NIC	PAN	PER	PRY	SLV	URY	ARE	BHR	IRQ	JOR	KWT	OMN	PSE	QAT	SAU
Gerardi RV	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
		116.768	5.621	2.016	4.613.918	1.045	54.489	579.198	1.166.648	3.587	7.640	30.811	2.480	37.168	3.813	117.285	11.332	65.338	95.939	77.840	130.420	115.267	83.734	70.391	9.257	280.381	22.839	28.735	6.820	2.870	3.906	23.082	44.287	7.033	4.825	6.460	109.484	12.804	35.410	9.906	41.253	28.550	3.177	89.258	236.148
		% Diff G-RV / scaled EKS-RV																																											
		15.6	5.0	14.5	3.1	-0.0	0.2	16.6	1.1	7.1	-2.6	-0.3	6.2	5.5	-1.8	4.8	3.3	-0.8	-1.1	-3.0	-7.9	-2.0	11.6	2.4	3.6	1.1	5.5	2.4	-0.6	9.6	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.6	-0.3	2.0	4.0	6.2	3.9	4.5	1.2	10.1	2.1	5.4	1.8
		Calculation by EKS-PPPs scaled to ICP143 by XRS																																											
RV-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
PPP-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
NV	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
RV-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																											
PPP-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																											
NV	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																											
RV-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																											
PPP-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																											
NV	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																											
RV-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																											
PPP-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																											
NV	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																											
RV as Sum	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
		% Difference (RV by scaled EKS-PPP Total=100)																																											
	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
		13.9	3.6	13.4	2.5	-7.7	0.2	15.8	0.7	3.4	-0.5	-2.5	3.9	1.4	-2.4	3.1	2.7	-2.6	-0.9	-3.1	-8.8	-4.7	9.4	1.2	-0.1	0.5	5.6	2.7	-0.1	9.2	2.1	2.0	1.8	1.5	1.3	2.0	2.7	4.7	1.4	3.9	0.8	7.0	0.5	1.7	-0.1
		Calculation by EKS-PPPs to USD																																											
RV-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
PPP-EKS	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
NV	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
RV-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																											
PPP-EKS	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																											
NV	1501100	MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT																																											
RV-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																											
PPP-EKS	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																											
NV	1501200	CONSTRUCTION																																											
RV-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																											
PPP-EKS	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																											
NV	1501300	OTHER PRODUCTS																																											
RV as Sum	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
		% Difference (RV by EKS-PPP to USD Total=100)																																											
	1501000	GROSS FIXED CAPITAL FORMATION																																											
		91.8	54.7	88.8	56.1	-4.6	22.5	100.4	41.2	52.2	38.2	27.1	55.4	44.2	27.7	52.6	52.8	27.0	33.8	5.9	8.5	1.3	80.4	40.3	5.3	26.3	73.7	58.4	14.3	108.1	17.7	68.7	41.4	40.6	37.0	41.8	48.3	66.0	25.8	65.5	27.8	75.7	57.9	37.5	18.4

