



ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЙ  
И СОЦИАЛЬНЫЙ СОВЕТ

Distr.  
GENERAL

CES/1999/1  
22 June 1998

RUSSIAN  
Original: ENGLISH

СТАТИСТИЧЕСКАЯ КОМИССИЯ и  
ЕВРОПЕЙСКАЯ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКАЯ КОМИССИЯ

КОНФЕРЕНЦИЯ ЕВРОПЕЙСКИХ СТАТИСТИКОВ

Сорок седьмая пленарная сессия

(Невшатель, 14-16 июня 1999 года)

ДОКЛАД О РАБОТЕ ИЮньСКОГО (1998 ГОДА) КОНСУЛЬТАЦИОННОГО СОВЕЩАНИЯ  
ПО ПРОГРАММЕ ЕВРОПЕЙСКИХ СОПОСТАВЛЕНИЙ В РАМКАХ ГРУППЫ II

Записка, подготовленная секретариатом

**ВВЕДЕНИЕ**

1. По приглашению Австрийского центрального статистического управления (АЦСУ) было организовано консультационное совещание по Программе европейских сопоставлений (ПЕС) в рамках Группы II, которое состоялось 3-5 июня 1998 года в Вене. В его работе участвовали представители Австрии, Албании, Беларуси, Болгарии, Боснии и Герцеговины, бывшей югославской Республики Македонии, Венгрии, Италии, Латвии, Литвы, Молдовы, Польши, Российской Федерации, Румынии, Словацкой Республики, Словении, Соединенного Королевства, Финляндии, Хорватии, Чешской Республики, Швейцарии, Эстонии и Украины. На нем также присутствовали представители Статистического управления Европейских сообществ (Евростат), Организации экономического сотрудничества и развития (ОЭСР), Всемирного банка и Межгосударственного статистического комитета Содружества Независимых Государств (СТАТ СНГ).

2. Участники утвердили предварительную повестку дня.

3. Председателем совещания был избран г-н Альфред Франц (Австрия).

GE.98-31388 (R)

## **ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ РАБОТЫ КОНСУЛЬТАЦИОННОГО СОВЕЩАНИЯ**

4. Участники совещания обсудили следующие вопросы:

- a) представление результатов общего осуществления ПЕС за 1996 год;
- b) доклады о деятельности в области сопоставления в регионах ПЕС/ПМС, опыт, накопленный в ходе осуществления этапа сопоставлений 1996 года;
- c) конкретное согласование усилий в ходе этапа сопоставлений 1996 года: новая методология сопоставления квартирной платы; используемые в настоящее время методы анализа данных о нерыночных услугах (НРУ);
- d) новое согласованное семейство классификаций и его взаимосвязь с ПЕС/ПМС;
- e) организационные изменения в рамках программы ППС Евростат/ОЭСР: распределение по группам, роль "ведущих стран"; методика "скользящего базового периода", сроки проведения обзоров в рамках этапа сопоставлений 1999 года;
- f) будущая методология для НРУ;
- g) методика анализа сальдо внешнеторгового баланса;
- h) расписание совещаний всех групп ПЕС 1999 года;
- i) ПЕС и "ЕВРО".

5. Обсуждение велось на основе документов, подготовленных Австрией, Евростатом, ОЭСР, Всемирным банком, и докладов, подготовленных Албанией, бывшей югославской Республикой Македония, Болгарией и Чешской Республикой.

## **РЕКОМЕНДАЦИИ В ОТНОШЕНИИ БУДУЩЕЙ ДЕЯТЕЛЬНОСТИ**

### **Публикация результатов ПЕС 1996 года**

6. Участники совещания подчеркнули важность скорейшей публикации результатов осуществления ПЕС, охватывающих все группы стран. Участники совещания предложили ЕЭК взять на себя ответственность, как и в ходе предыдущих этапов, за публикацию результатов. С учетом того, что АЦСУ, Евростат и ОЭСР планируют опубликовать результаты своей деятельности в ближайшие несколько месяцев, участники совещания решили, что общие результаты ПЕС следует также опубликовать до конца 1998 года. В случае необходимости объем пояснительного текста можно было бы сократить с целью ускорения публикации этих результатов. Участники совещания просили ЕЭК провести

консультации с другими международными организациями на предмет нахождения путей содействия процессу публикации результатов.

7. Участники совещания указали на желательность своевременного издания соответствующими организациями совместного коммюнике. Была также подчеркнута необходимость обеспечения согласованности результатов, содержащихся в публикациях различных соответствующих организаций.

#### **Будущие консультационные совещания**

8. Участники совещания указали на желательность проведения последующих совещаний и консультаций с учетом предлагаемой новой структуры организации работы ПЕС в рамках программы ППС Евростат/ОЭСР и предлагаемых сроков осуществления мероприятий по этапу ПЕС 1999 года. Многие участники выразили озабоченность по поводу сжатых сроков, предусмотренных для реорганизации деятельности.

9. Участники совещания рекомендовали организовать осенью 2000 года совместное консультационное совещание при участии всех международных и национальных статистических управлений, непосредственно занимающихся расчетом ППС на этапе 1999 года.

#### **Будущая деятельность**

10. Участники совещания рекомендовали включить в программу работы Конференции следующий текст:

- a) ЕЭК следует взять на себя ответственность, как и в ходе предыдущих этапов, за публикацию результатов осуществления ПЕС 1996 года и, при возможности, опубликовать общие результаты осуществления ПЕС до конца 1998 года. ЕЭК следует провести консультации с другими международными организациями на предмет нахождения путей содействия процессу публикации результатов.
- b) Совместное консультационное совещание при участии всех международных и национальных статистических управлений, непосредственно занимающихся расчетом ППС на этапе 1999 года, следует организовать осенью 2000 года.

#### **ВЫВОДЫ**

11. Более подробное резюме основных выводов, сделанных в ходе совещания, содержится (только на английском языке) в приложении.

12. Участники совещания утвердили доклад о его работе на своем заключительном заседании.

-----

ANNEX

Consultation on the European Comparison Programme  
within Group II  
Vienna, 3-5 June 1998

Summary of the main conclusions reached at the meeting

1. Provisional results for the Group I countries were presented by the OECD. For the first time they also covered Mexico, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Israel, Poland, the Russian Federation, the Slovak Republic and Slovenia. Eurostat was responsible for the results for 19 of the Group I countries, including all the member countries of the EU, for whom some provisional results were already published. It was explained that some difficulties were being experienced in assuring that the results for a few countries, such as the Russian Federation, Slovenia and Turkey, which participate in more than one group, were consistent between the groups. The meeting took note of the results, bearing in mind that they would be subject to some further revisions before they were finalized.
2. The Austrian Central Statistical Office presented the results for the Group II countries. In contrast to previous years, the results for Group II were calculated using a multilateral method in order to ensure consistency with the methodology used by Eurostat. Some progress as well as problems encountered were explained, in particular the difficulties experienced in calculating PPPs for non-market services.
3. The meeting was informed that the work within group III countries started in 1994 and the results were published in March 1998. The publication contains data for 1994, 1995 and 1996 (preliminary) including the CIS countries except Ukraine, Mongolia and Turkey. The work has been carried out by OECD in cooperation with the CIS Statistical Committee, Goskomstat of Russian Federation and the Turkish Statistical Office .
4. The meeting discussed at some length the most appropriate way in which to link together the results for the three groups of countries. Some participants advocated the use of a simple and transparent method using a link country. Others argued for the use of an overall multilateral procedure. It was suggested that some analysis should be made of the advantages and disadvantages of different methods of linking.

5. It was agreed that it was important to publish results covering all three groups of countries as soon as possible: that is for all countries participating in the OECD-European- CIS comparison.
6. The meeting proposed that the ECE as the international organisation which covers all three groups should assume responsibility for the publication of the results as in previous rounds. It was suggested that the ECE should consult with all the international and national statistical offices directly involved in the calculation of PPPs (in particular Eurostat, OECD and the Austrian Central Statistical Office) on the most appropriate way in which to integrate the results for the various groups into a single set of European Comparisons.
7. It was agreed that the results for Group I countries will also be presented and published according to the ICP expenditure classification.
8. The Austrian Central Statistical Office presented a paper on the treatment of non-market services in the calculation of PPPs for 1996 within Group II. The meeting was reminded that in December 1997 it had been agreed that PPPs for non-market services should be based on input prices without any adjustments for estimated differences in productivity between countries. This change was needed especially for candidate countries, in order to conform with the methodology used by Eurostat and also by the OECD. On the other hand, it produced some incomparabilities with results for previous rounds in which a productivity adjustment was applied for Group II countries.
9. A second and more general paper by Austrian Central Statistical Office addressed the question of the alternative possibilities available for calculating PPPs for non-market services. While participants agreed that, in principle, the PPPs should be based on data relating to the outputs of non-market services, it was also generally accepted that this would not be feasible in the foreseeable future. In this situation, second best methods have to be used instead.
10. One method commonly employed is to use data on input prices or quantities combined with an assumption that productivity levels are the same for non-market services across all countries. An alternative is to assume that the PPPs for non-market services is the same as for the rest of the economy (i.e. to use a general "reference" PPP for non-market services).

11. Participants recognised that, in the absence of information on outputs of non-market services, whatever method is used is liable to produce biased estimates, depending on the 'realism' of the assumption underlying the method of estimation. In some cases, such biases may lead to results which may appear implausible in the case of particular countries.

12. After a lengthy discussion it was agreed by the participants that for the time being there is no way of avoiding the use of assumptions even though they may sometimes lead to biased results. It was stressed that it is important to explain the nature of the problem to users.

13. Despite its limitations, most participants favoured continuing with the method now used, which is relatively simple and easy to explain. They also stressed that the same method must be used for all countries, although some other participants disagreed with this, arguing that the use of the same method does not necessarily lead to results which are comparable between countries when their economic circumstances are different. Moreover, these participants expressed their concern that some numerical results for 1996 appear so anomalous that the whole PPP exercise is exposed to undesirable criticism.

14. It was agreed that it is essential to continue to experiment with alternative assumptions and methods to see if better ways of estimating PPPs for non-market services can be developed. It was emphasized that continuing with the existing method does not mean that it is accepted as satisfactory, but that there is no other method available which can be demonstrated to be superior at the present time. Research on this topic should be continued in order to try to develop improved methods.

15. The meeting was informed about the new harmonized family of classifications and its interdependence with ECP on the basis of papers prepared by OECD. Countries were invited to submit comments to OECD on the proposed revised classification of individual consumption expenditure of households by basic headings.

16. The implementation of 1993 SNA (or 1995 ESA) and the implications for the ECP were discussed on the basis of a paper presented by OECD. The new 1993 SNA differs in a number of ways from 1968 SNA. Some conceptual differences between the two versions that affect the recording of national expenditure and the differences between their underlying classifications of goods and services, government expenditure and industry were identified.

17. The representative of CIS Statistical Committee informed the participants about the progress made in the implementation of 1993 SNA by the CIS countries. Most of the new SNA concepts have been implemented in close cooperation with the OECD. However, there are still some exceptions which concern the FISIM and the treatment of hidden economy. CIS countries are still treating FISIM as recommended in the 1968 SNA and their estimates for the hidden economy do not explicitly include illegal activities.

18. The meeting was informed by Eurostat about the organisational changes of the work within the Eurostat - OECD PPP Programme: the creation of four groups of countries, the role of the "lead countries", and the rolling benchmark approach. Eurostat pointed out that the reorganisation of the Eurostat comparison should be regarded as a purely administrative matter and not a methodological one, although some participants expressed doubts about it.

19. It was explained that the reorganisation is necessary because of the enlargement of the group of countries coordinated by Eurostat to 29. This is considered too large a group to use the same common list of items and to organise meetings effectively. It is believed that the reorganization of the ECP work will improve the field work which will also lead to better and timely results. Candidate countries will be distributed over the proposed four groups.

20. At the high level meeting on PPPs in Lisbon which took place in May 1998, the idea of the reorganisation was discussed and agreed in principle with a final decision to be taken in September 1998. It is expected that the new organisation will be implemented in the spring of 1999. It was pointed out that the composition of the groups is meant to achieve better results based on shorter lists of goods and services.

21. The confidentiality rules in force with regard to data collection will be strictly followed.

22. The role of national statistical offices will remain the same. It was explained that the "lead" countries will coordinate and check data within the groups.

23. It was also explained that the central processing and dissemination of the results will be done only by Eurostat, including the updating of the results, and the fixity principle used in the past will be retained. Some participants expressed concern about fixity in the context of a wider group of comparisons.

24. Eurostat's representative summarised the findings in the Castles' Report which evaluates the joint Eurostat - OECD PPP Programme. Mr. Castles' report underlined the importance of using PPPs for international comparison and expressed concern about inadequate financing. The report makes some constructive criticisms and suggestions about difficult areas, such as non-market services.

25. The World Bank explained their work programme in the field of PPPs at a world level. They are considering the possibility of working with the statistical offices of the Russian Federation and the CIS now that the OECD is no longer actively involved with most CIS countries. The representative of the World Bank also presented a paper in which it is shown that it is preferable to convert the net foreign balance by PPPs rather than exchange rates.

-----