

PPPs for Industry Output: A New Dataset for International Comparisons

by Marcel P. Timmer, Gerard Ypma and Bart van Ark¹
Groningen Growth and Development Centre
University of Groningen

October 2006

Paper to be presented at
OECD Workshop on Productivity Analysis and Measurement
Bern 16-18 October 2006

Discussion Session on Productivity Levels and Industry PPPs
Item 25

Abstract

International comparisons of output, prices and productivity have been hampered by the unavailability of comprehensive sets of PPPs at the industry level. Existing expenditure PPPs and production PPPs both have their limitations. This paper proposes to use a mix of both for industry level comparisons. On the basis of a supply-use framework, the paper identifies how expenditure prices and output prices are conceptually related. It develops criteria on the basis of which an optimal mix of expenditure PPPs and production PPPs can be chosen. The paper then shows a PPP dataset for gross output for 45 industries (capturing the total economy) and 25 advanced countries. This dataset is the first comprehensive dataset of PPPs covering this large number of industries and countries. We illustrate its potential for research purposes by analysing patterns of relative prices in manufacturing and services.

¹ This paper has been prepared under sponsorship from the National Science Foundation research project on "Improved Methods of Estimating Production and Income Across Nations" and the "EU KLEMS project on Productivity in the European Union" (6th Framework Programme, Priority 8, "Policy Support and Anticipating Scientific and Technological Needs").

1. Introduction

The use of Purchasing Power Parities (PPPs) for a range of analytical purposes has recently received renewed attention in the literature. Traditionally, PPPs are used for international comparisons of income, expenditure, output and productivity. They play a pivotal role in research on growth and convergence in the world economy (Maddison, 2001, 2005). On-going debates on, for example, the law of one price, the theory of the real exchange rate and the Balassa-Samuelson hypothesis have been revisited by several scholars (Rogoff 1996, Taylor and Taylor, 2004). PPPs have also been readdressed in various studies of price convergence of goods and services, for example in the European Union (Canzoneri et al., 1999; Goldberg and Verboven, 2004). They also play an important role in historical comparisons of relative income and productivity, both at aggregate and industry level (Broadberry, 1997; Ward and Devereux, 2003; Broadberry, 2003). PPPs are also indispensable in empirical applications of international trade and endogenous growth theories (Harrigan, 1999; Griffith, Redding and van Reenen, 2004).

Most studies, however, are based more or less exclusively on a purchasing power parity concept that is rooted in the expenditure approach. Such studies make use of expenditure PPPs which are directly obtained from the International Comparisons Project (which are constructed under the auspices of Eurostat, OECD and the World Bank) or, more indirectly, from the Penn World Tables which are based on ICP (Summers and Heston, 1991; Heston et al., 2002).

A major part of the research in this area, however, by definition requires PPPs by industry (agriculture, manufacturing and services), rather than by expenditure category. This is especially true for studies that focus on sectoral price and productivity issues. Balassa-Samuelson type studies also require measures of relative price levels of tradeable vis-à-vis non-tradeable sectors. Convergence studies are increasingly made at the industry level and tests of endogenous growth models require level measures relative to the world productivity frontier by industry. More generally, studies that focus on the dynamics of growth from a perspective of structural change, need to take account of industry-specific PPPs (Szirmai and Pilat 1990; van Ark, 1996; O'Mahony 1999; Timmer, 2000). The need to complement PPPs based on the expenditure approach with PPPs from the production approach is generally acknowledged. For example, Bernard and Jones (2001) state that "...future research is needed to construct conversion factors appropriate to each sector and that research relying on international comparisons of sectoral productivity and income should proceed with caution until these conversion factors are available" (p. 1169).

However, most studies claim that production PPPs are scarce and empirically difficult to obtain. Until recently, available datasets included only a small number of countries, and were often based on bilateral (pairwise) comparisons instead of multilateral comparisons (see van Ark and Timmer, 2001; Maddison and van Ark, 2002). This precludes cross-country regression work and hampers generalisations. In addition, the coverage of industries is incomplete with several studies for

agriculture and manufacturing, but a lack of production PPPs for services and no possibility to develop aggregate PPPs for the total economy from the industry side. More fundamentally, it is often pointed out that there are measurement and data difficulties with existing production PPPs, which mainly relate to the lack of readily available producer price surveys. The main practical objection against using production PPPs is that these are mostly based on ratios of unit values, which might not adequately reflect differences in product mix and product quality between countries (see, for example, Jorgenson, 1993; and Lichtenberg, 1993). Hence except for some pioneering attempts for a few countries, there has so far not been a comprehensive production PPP dataset, both in terms of country and industry coverage.²

As an alternative to using production PPPs, some studies resorted to the use of 'adjusted' expenditure prices as a proxy for prices for industry output in the PPP literature, for example Jorgenson, Nishimizu and Kuroda (1987) and Lee and Tang (2001). But this approach has its own disadvantages. Whereas PPPs for output should be based on a domestic basic price concept, expenditure PPPs are based on purchasers' prices and include prices of imports. Hence they need to be adjusted to a basic price concept. Unfortunately the exact nature of these adjustments have not been clearly spelled out in the literature so far. Moreover some of the adjustment factors, especially for international trade prices, are often not available. Moreover expenditure PPPs are not always a feasible option for certain industries because no data is available for prices of intermediate product items.

Some scholars have therefore made a case for the use of expenditure PPPs alongside production PPPs to increase the coverage of industries and countries (Pilat 1996, O'Mahony 1996, Van Ark and Timmer 2001). In this paper we follow this up by introducing, for the first time, a comprehensive dataset of PPPs for industry output based on a mix of adjusted expenditure PPPs and production PPPs. We first set out a framework to reconcile measures of expenditure and domestic output prices, based on the Supply and Use framework of the European System of Accounts (ESA) 1995. We use this framework to investigate under which circumstances adjusted expenditure prices are a reasonable proxy for basic output prices, and which adjustments need to be made. This information is used to prepare a set of PPPs at industry level which consists of adjusted expenditure PPPs and production PPPs. Given available data sources we select for each industry the best possible proxy for the the relative price of gross output. The new dataset includes PPPs for gross output 45 major industries, covering the total economy, and 25 countries for 1997.

This study builds upon earlier work in the International Comparisons of Output and Productivity (ICOP) project at the University of Groningen. Over the past two decades more than 60 ICOP studies have appeared, which together add up to comparisons for more than 100 countries in agriculture, over 30 countries in manufacturing, and more than 10 countries in a variety of

² See Mulder (2002) for Brazil and Mexico and Pilat (1994) for South Korea and Japan for early examples.

services industries.³ In particular this study makes use of recent work by Ypma (2006) for transport and communication, Timmer and Ypma (2006) for distributive trade, and Inklaar, O'Mahony, Robinson and Timmer (2003) for manufacturing. In these studies new data sources for various industries have been exploited, including the use of farm producer price data from the FAO and a harmonized database on manufacturing production for European countries (PRODCOM), which is much more detailed than the data sets used before. The main differences between the earlier studies and the present one are the following:

- This study uses a mix of PPP sources. Alongside production PPPs based on producer prices or output unit values, it makes use of adjusted expenditure PPPs from ICP where appropriate.
- It applies a multilateral (EKS) weighting system for all industries, building up from a detailed 3-digit industry level and using a single set of output weights in aggregation.
- The country and industry coverage is much bigger than in earlier datasets.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 of this paper sets out the framework to reconcile measures of prices based on expenditure and production approaches. Our key result is the derivation of a precise relationship between final expenditure prices and industry output prices. Using a supply-use framework, we show that final expenditure prices need to be adjusted for trade and transportation margins, for taxes and subsidies, for prices of exports and imports and for prices of intermediate use, to provide a good proxy for domestic output prices. We also indicate how well the expenditure PPP proxy can be used for different groups of products. Section 3 discusses the basic set up of the present database. At the most detailed level, we derive binary PPPs for 221 three digit industries. The basic 3-digit production PPPs are based on a mix of expenditure PPPs and production PPPs. These binaries are multilateralised above the 3-digit level by using the EKS method. Section 3 also provides a general motivation of the particular mix of expenditure PPPs and production PPPs which is chosen. This is discussed in much more detail in Section 4, providing data sources and methodology on an industry-by-industry basis. Section 5 introduces the new dataset of PPPs for gross output. This data can potentially shed new light on a wide range of issues as discussed above. We illustrate this by discussing some of the first results on relative price levels in manufacturing and services. Section 6 concludes and indicates next steps, including work on PPPs for intermediate and factor inputs, and the derivation of value added and productivity measures.

³ Van Ark and Timmer (2001) and Maddison and van Ark (2002) provide overviews. See <http://www.ggd.net> for downloadable studies

2. The link between output and expenditure prices within a Supply-Use Table (SUT) framework

For aggregate comparisons, expenditure prices are the common basis for measures of GDP PPP, hereafter named ‘expenditure PPPs. For comparisons of industry output, however, the conceptually correct PPP is based on basic output prices by industry, hereafter named ‘production PPPs’. As discussed in the introduction, production PPPs have not been available on a large scale, and certainly not for all industries. Therefore there has been an increasing plea for using expenditure PPPs alongside production PPPs to increase the coverage of industries (Pilát 1996, O’Mahony 1996, Van Ark and Timmer 2001). However, so far it has not been clearly outlined, under which conditions expenditure PPPs provide a good proxy for the PPPs of gross output and what kind of adjustments are needed. In the pioneering work of Jorgenson, Nishimizu and Kuroda (1987) two adjustments were made. First, expenditure PPPs were re-allocated from expenditure categories to industry groups. For example, expenditure prices of bread and sugar were allocated to food manufacturing. In a second step, the expenditure PPPs were adjusted to a basic price concept by ‘peeling off’ trade and transport margins and taxes net of subsidies. We call these ‘adjusted expenditure PPPs’. However, as pointed out by other authors, the adjustments made are not sufficient. A correction for international trade is also needed, as expenditure prices include prices of imports and exclude prices of exports. This is especially important for comparisons involving small-open economies (Hooper and Vrankovich, 1995).⁴ Finally, output prices reflect not only prices for final consumption, but also for intermediate use, for which expenditure PPPs are not available at all (van Ark 1996).

So far, the exact nature of the adjustments required to obtain adjusted expenditure PPPs at industry level has not been clearly spelled out in the literature. Moreover, the criteria on the basis of which to choose between adjusted expenditure PPPs and production PPPs has not been motivated. In this section, we use the basic balance equation between supply and use of goods in the Supply-and-Use table (SUT) framework to derive an exact relationship between expenditure and industry output prices. This relationship is used to indicate which adjustments need to be made to expenditure prices to be a reasonable proxy for basic output prices (Section 2.1). Next, we describe under which circumstances, and for which industries, these adjustments are likely to be empirically important (Section 2.2). In the remainder of this paper this framework is used to compile a mix of production PPPs and adjusted expenditure PPPs, which together provide the best possible set of PPPs for industry output, given current available datasources.

2.1 The link between output and expenditure prices

Supply and use tables provide a convenient way of summarising and presenting a coherent set of economic transactions within a country. For the purpose of this paper, its usefulness is in the clear

⁴ Jorgenson, Nishimizu and Kuroda (1987) provided a comparison of U.S.-Japan productivity levels for which this problem is less urgent, although not insignificant

link between various price concepts of products: basic price, producer price and purchasers' price. These are linked in the following way:

Producer price = basic price of the product received by the producer + taxes
on the product - subsidies on the product

Purchasers' price = producer price + trade and transport margins in
delivering the product to the purchaser

In the SUT framework, the valuation of domestic output is at basic prices, while the use of products (intermediate and final use) is recorded at purchasers' prices.⁵ Below we provide an exposition of the full structure of the SUT framework. The following notation is used:

Commodities $i, i=1, \dots, m$ and industries $j, j=1, \dots, n$

S_i = the quantity of total supply of product i

U_i = the quantity of total use of the product i

M_i = the imported quantity of product i

F_i = quantity of product i for final domestic demand

E_i = quantity of product i exported

Y_{ij} = the quantity of commodity i produced by industry j

X_{ij} = the quantity of commodity i used as intermediate input by industry j

P_{ij}^Y = the basic price received by industry j for selling commodity i

P_{ij}^X = the purchasers' price paid by industry j for intermediate consumption of commodity i

P_i^M = the basic (c.i.f) price of imported commodity i .

P_i^F = the purchasers' price for final domestic demand of commodity i

P_i^E = the purchasers' (f.o.b) price of exported commodity i

T = total taxes net of subsidies on products

R = total trade and transport margins

r_i^S = trade and transport margin rate on supplied product i

⁵ Exports are valued at free on board (f.o.b.) prices and the imports at cost, insurance and freight (c.i.f.) prices. The export fob price is essentially a purchasers' price including net taxes and trade and transport margins up to the border of the exporting country. The import cif price is essentially a basic price but excluding net taxes levied after crossing the border and trade and transport margins within the country.

t_i^S = net tax rate on on supplied product i

GVA_j = value added of industry j at basic prices

A capital V in front of a symbol is used to indicate value.

Table 1 provides a simplified outline of a Supply and Use Table. Both tables have commodities in the rows, and industries in the columns. The Use table indicates for each product i its usage: intermediate, final domestic demand or exports. The last column indicates total use. The entries are at purchasers' prices. In addition, the Use table contains a value added block. For each industry j , total intermediate input at purchasers' prices plus value added at basic price adds up to gross output at basic prices. This is given in the last row.

The Supply table indicates the origin for each product, which is either domestic production or import. The fifth column records total supply at basic prices. The other columns provide information on taxes and subsidies on products and trade and transport margins. These are needed to arrive at total supply at purchasers' prices which can be set against total use at purchasers' prices from the Use table. Output of all products produced in industry j valued at basic prices sums to gross output at basic prices in this industry. This total is given in the last row in the supply table.

The Supply and Use tables are linked by two basic identities: the row identity which requires balance between use and supply for each product, and the column identity which requires identity for each industry between the sum of gross output over all products produced in an industry on the one hand, and value added plus intermediate consumption on the other. For this study, the first identity is important. It links the expenditure and production approach at the product level. The identity should hold both in terms of quantities and values. In quantity terms:

$$X_i + F_i + E_i = S_i \quad \forall i \quad (1)$$

This identity states that the quantity of supply of product i must be equal to its use, consisting of intermediate use, final domestic demand and exports. In value terms, at purchasers' prices, the identity is :

$$VX_i + VF_i + VE_i = VS_i + T_i + R_i \quad \forall i \quad (2)$$

The value of total intermediate use of i (VX_i) is equal to the sum of values of intermediate use of i by all producers, and the total value of supply (VS_i) is equal to the value of supply by all

producers and imports. By rewriting values as the product of prices and quantities, (2) can be stated as:

$$\sum_j P_{ij}^X X_{ij} + P_i^F F_i + P_i^E E_i = (1+t_i^S + r_i^S) \left(\sum_j P_{ij}^Y Y_{ij} + P_i^M M_i \right) \quad \forall i \quad (3)$$

By rewriting equation (3), the relationship between purchasers' prices (P_{ij}^X P_i^F P_i^E) on the one hand and basic output prices (P_{ij}^Y) on the other can be derived. This identity provides the basic relationship between the final domestic demand price and output price at the product level which we are looking for. To bring out this relationship more clearly we assume, without loss of generality, that there is only one basic price in the system for an individual product i , that is, the basic output price of a product is independent from its industry of origin:

Assumption 1

$$P_{ij}^Y = P_i^Y \quad \forall i, j \quad (4)$$

By rearranging equation (3), substituting (4) and using identity (1), the following basic result can be derived (omitting index i for clarity)

Result 1

Under assumption 1, the general relationship between basic output prices and final domestic demand prices can be written as

$$P^Y = \tilde{P}^F + A^{E,M} + A^X \quad (5a)$$

Result 1 shows the key result for our purpose. It indicates that three types of adjustments are needed to derive an output price from a final domestic demand price: (1) an adjustment for margins and taxes (\tilde{P}^F); (2) an adjustment for international trade ($A^{E,M}$) and (3) an adjustment for intermediate consumption (A^X). The adjustments can be spelled out as follows

$$\tilde{P}^F = \frac{1}{(1+t^S + r^S)} P^F \quad (5b)$$

$$A^{E,M} = \frac{1}{(1+t^S+r^S)} \left[(P^E - P^F) \frac{E}{Y} - ((1+t^S+r^S)P^M - P^F) \frac{M}{Y} \right] \quad (5c)$$

$$A^X = \frac{1}{(1+t^S+r^S)} \sum_j (P_j^X - P^F) \frac{X_j}{Y} \quad (5d)$$

The first term (5b) is the final expenditure price⁶, adjusted for average net taxes and margins on total supply of the product. In fact, this adjusted final expenditure price has been used as a proxy for output prices by, for example, by Jorgenson, Nishimizu and Kuroda (1987) and Lee and Tang (2001). However, our result shows that two further adjustments are needed. The second adjustment is for international trade (5c). The size of the adjustment depends on the differences between the final expenditure prices and the export and import prices, and on the ratio of export and import to total domestic output. In a pioneering attempt, Hooper and Vrankovich (1996) have tried to adjust for international trade prices, but their methodology was ad-hoc and the adjustments based on very aggregate data, which has not been pursued further. Finally, the third adjustment (5d) depends on the size of the differences between the final expenditure price and the intermediate consumption price for a particular item, and on the ratio of intermediate consumption to total domestic output for that item. Adjustments for intermediate consumption have never been tried so far.

This basic result suggests that for products which are characterised by large shares of imports and exports and/or intermediate consumption in total output, adjustments for margins and taxes are not sufficient. Hence the more important international trade and intermediate use is, the weaker the proxy approach using adjusted expenditure PPPs. For industries which are mainly producing for final consumption, and which products are not (or hardly) internationally traded (e.g. personal services industries), the adjusted final expenditure price might be a reasonable proxy for the industry output price.

2.2 Biases in output price proxies based on expenditure prices

Next, we try to pin down more precisely the direction of the bias in using adjusted expenditure prices rather than basic output prices. This is important to know, because as stated in the introduction, production PPPs are not available for all industries and countries. Hence expenditure PPPs will always be needed to provide a complete set of PPPs for output covering the total economy. By making some additional, relatively harmless, assumptions, one can indicate the direction (under- or over-estimation) of the bias in using adjusted expenditure PPPs. To do so, we assume the following inequalities:

⁶ We use the term final expenditure and final domestic demand interchangeably.

Assumption 2

$$\begin{aligned} P_{ij}^X &< P_i^F \quad \forall i \\ P_i^E &< P_i^F \quad \forall i \\ (1+t_i^S + r_i^S)P_i^M &< P_i^F \quad \forall i \end{aligned}$$

We assume that the intermediate consumption and export purchasers' prices, and the import price adjusted with total supply net taxes and margins, are all lower in absolute terms than the final expenditure price. The plausibility of this assumption is motivated as follows. Trade margins for final expenditure are generally higher than for other uses. While wholesale margins may be identical across the board, final consumers typically purchase their goods through retailers and hence pay an additional retail margin on top of what intermediate users or exporters pay. Also, product tax rates for final consumers frequently differ from tax rates paid by producers for the same good. This is especially true for countries which have a VAT-system. Typically, VAT (value added tax) is being paid by final consumers, not by producers. In addition, one can deduce that net taxes and margins for total supply will be lower than the net taxes and margins for final expenditure.⁷

With these assumptions we can assess the difference between the adjusted expenditure price and the domestic output price. **Table 2** provides an overview of various possibilities for a particular good i . We distinguish the following two dimensions: the use of the product and the international tradeability of the product. The use-dimension subdivides into the following exclusive categories: final expenditure only, intermediate consumption only or both uses. The trade-dimension can be subdivided into: no trade, only exports, only imports, and both. For each case we indicate whether a adjusted expenditure price is a good proxy for the domestic output price. When the adjusted expenditure price is equal to the basic output price, this is indicated with a 0. When there is no expenditure price available, this is indicated by (n.a.). In all other cases the direction of the bias is known and indicated by the bias due to international trade ($A^{E,M}$) and/or intermediate consumption (A^X), or the direction of the bias is unknown as indicated by a '?'.

One can allocate each product in the economy to one of the 12 cells in Table 2, based on the proportions of final use, exports and imports. In Appendix Table 1 we show the shares of expenditure, intermediate and export demand in total use, and the shares of domestic production

⁷ We assume that there is no data on margins and taxes by use category, only for total supply. Margin and tax matrices are scarce indeed. If not, one could adjust final expenditure prices by the margins and taxes for final expenditure only, rather than for total supply.

and imports in total supply for each major sector for a large economy (the U.S.) and a small open economy (the Netherlands),. Based on this information, we discuss examples of products which fall into each of the 12 possible cases.⁸

Case 1: when the product is not internationally traded and all domestically produced goods are for final expenditure, the adjusted expenditure price is equal to the basic output price. This is typically true for products in the construction sector, hotels and restaurants, real estate and public services (including education and health).

Cases 2, 5, 8 and 11: when the product is only used for intermediate consumption, no final expenditure price exists. Obviously, the domestic output price cannot be proxied by expenditure prices in these cases, and seeking an independent basic output price is the only alternative. For a large number of agricultural, mining and basic manufacturing products this holds true, as well as for large parts of business services.

Case 3: when the product is not internationally traded, but is partly used for intermediate consumption and partly for final use, the adjusted final expenditure price overestimates the basic output price. In this case, E and M, and hence $A^{E,M}$ are zero and as we assumed that the intermediate consumption price is lower than the final expenditure price, A^X will be negative. This is the case for products from utilities, distributive trade, finance and personal and other services.

Cases 4 and 6: when the product is exported, but not imported, and used both as a final and an intermediate good, the adjusted final expenditure price also overestimates the basic output price. In case 4, $A^{E,M}$ is negative and A^X zero, while in case 6 both are negative. This situation is rare, but includes examples such as products from the transport sector in the Netherlands.

Case 7: when the product is only imported and only used as a final good ($X=E=0$), the adjusted final expenditure price underestimates the basic output price. This is opposite to case 4, as A^X will be zero and $A^{E,M}$ positive. Examples include non-durable manufacturing goods in the U.S.

Case 10: when the product is only used as a final good, but both imported and exported, the bias is unknown. On the one hand, it underestimates due to imports (see case 7), but it overestimates due to exports (see case 4). The combined effect is unknown. Examples include products from

⁸ Most products will of course be used for both final and intermediate uses, and there will always be some importing and exporting. The empirical distinction here is referring to “mainly” used for final consumption, rather than “only” used for final consumption, and likewise for the other categories.

durable manufacturing, and from some other manufacturing industries in the Netherlands (non-durable and food)

Case 9 and 12: when the product is imported and both a final and intermediate good, the bias is also unknown. On the one hand, it underestimates due to imports (see case 7), but it overestimates due to exports and intermediate use (see case 6). The combined effect is unknown.

Table 2 can be summarised in the following result:

Result 3

Under assumption 2, result 1 leads to the following:

- A. Only for final goods, which are not internationally traded, the adjusted final expenditure price are equal to the basic output prices.
- B. When the product is only used for intermediate consumption, the domestic output price cannot be estimated on the basis of a final expenditure price.
- C. When a product is mainly exported, the adjusted final expenditure price will overestimate the basic output price.
- D. In all other cases, the adjusted final expenditure price provides a biased estimator of the basic output price which size depends on the differences in purchasers' prices and the ratio of import, export and intermediate consumption to total output.

When price comparisons are made between countries as for PPPs, the important question in this context is whether the biases are of equal sign and size in both countries. When the bias can be assumed to be in the same direction and of a similar size in both countries, final expenditure price ratios might be a reasonable proxy of output price ratios. But if these assumptions do not hold, the adjusted final expenditure price provides a biased estimator of the basic output price ratios between the countries. This is most likely to be the case when comparing economies with very different trade/GDP ratios, such as a small open economy, like many small European economies, with a big economy like the U.S. or Germany.

3. A new dataset for gross output PPPs

In this paper we present a new database of PPPs for gross output for 45 industries and 25 countries for the year 1997. The 25 countries include 24 major OECD countries and Taiwan. The basic set-up of the database is as follows. At the most detailed level, we derive binary PPPs for 221 three digit industries. The basic 3-digit production PPPs are based on a mix of expenditure PPPs and production PPPs. These binaries are multilateralised above the 3-digit level by using the EKS method. In section 3.1. we describe the basic set up of our database above the industry level, in particular aggregation schemes. This includes the issues of weighting production PPPs to obtain higher aggregates. In section 3.2 we motivate our overall approach in choosing either an

adjusted expenditure PPP or a production PPP at the detailed industry level. For some industries only one of the two alternatives are available, but in other cases the sets of PPPs are overlapping, especially for manufacturing industries. The choice will be based on the criteria laid out in the previous section, combined with practical considerations, which also play an important role. We subsequently discuss in section 4 in much more detail our approach towards individual major sectors

3.1 Basic set-up above the 3-digit industry level

In compiling the new PPP dataset, we make a clear and consistent distinction between methodologies used above industry level and those below industry level, that is, for individual products or product groups. At the industry level there are 221 3-digit ISIC (rev 3) industries.⁹ For aggregation of industries the EKS method, proposed by Elteto and Koves (1964) and Szulc (1964), is applied. This method is designed to construct transitive multilateral comparisons from a matrix of original binary/pairwise comparisons which does not satisfy the transitivity property. The EKS method in its original format uses the binary Fisher PPPs (F_{jk} ; $j, k=1, \dots, M$) as the starting point. The computational form for the EKS index is given by:

$$EKS_{jk} = \prod_{l=1}^M [F_{jl} \cdot F_{lk}]^{1/M} \quad (6)$$

with EKS_{jk} the EKS PPP between country j and k . The formula defines the EKS index as an unweighted geometric average of the linked (or chained) comparisons between countries j and k using each of the countries in the comparisons as a link. The EKS method does not only produce comparisons that are transitive, but the indices also satisfy the important property that the index deviates the least from the pairwise Fisher binary comparisons.¹⁰

The weights used in the industry aggregation are based on gross output.¹¹ As there is no readily available data source on gross output covering all 221 industries, gross output by industry was specifically constructed for the purpose of this study. The dataset is based on gross output figures from the OECD STAN database. However, STAN only provides a limited amount of information on industries at 3 digit level. The gaps were filled with output shares obtained from Use tables (obtained from Eurostat or from NSI's in individual countries) and industry statistics, such as the OECD Industrial Structure Database (I&S), the Eurostat Structural Business Statistics Database, national censuses and industry surveys, etc.. In all cases, however, the consistency with OECD STAN at a higher level was maintained.

⁹ This is comparable to the number of basic headings used in the ICP programme. The basic heading is the lowest level in the ICP expenditure approach from which aggregation takes place.

¹⁰ Since the Fisher index is considered to be "ideal" and possesses a number of desirable properties, the EKS method has a certain appeal since it preserves the Fisher indices to the extent possible, while constructing multilateral index numbers. This property is in line with the property of characteristicity discussed by Drechsler (1973). See Prasada Rao and Timmer (2003) for weighted variants of the EKS.

¹¹ Gross output weights were preferred over value added weights (as in previous ICOP studies), because the PPPs reflect relative prices of gross output, not value added.

In specifying the aggregation weights, we take account of the reliability of the 3-digit PPPs. Reliability depends on the percentage of output covered by the PPPs, the coefficient of variation of the PPPs and/or the number of product matches within an industry (see section 4 for precise definitions). If the PPP was considered to be reliable, the gross output for the entire industry was used as a weight. Otherwise only that part of industry output that is covered by the item PPPs (so-called “matched output”) is used, effectively giving a lower weight compared to a reliable PPP. Below the basic heading (3-digit) level a variety of methods have been used, depending on data availability. These are described in the next sections.

3.2 Production PPPs or adjusted expenditure PPPs?

For the PPPs at 3-digit industry level, we compiled two sets of PPPs where possible, that is, production PPPs based on output unit values and producer prices, and a set of adjusted expenditure PPPs. In this section we motivate our general approach to making a choice, using the criteria laid out in the previous section. For some industries only one of the two alternatives are available. Production PPPs are not available for a number of services industries due to a lack of appropriate value data at industry level and the difficulty of defining quantities. In some manufacturing industries the use of expenditure PPPs is not an option because no expenditure price data are available for intermediate product items.

At industry level, the production PPPs, as traditionally developed in the ICOP programme, are theoretically the most preferable PPPs. However, practical considerations must be taken into account as well. The main practical objection against using production PPPs is that these are mostly based on ratios of unit values. Basic prices for specified items at producer level are often not available. Unit values often suffer from ‘product mix’ and ‘product quality’ problems in international comparisons. Unit value ratios may also be biased towards samples of products which are relatively homogeneous, less sophisticated goods. Production PPPs are then not representative of the more upgraded, high-quality varieties in the same industry. These criticisms have surfaced in the past (see e.g. Jorgenson 1993 and Lichtenberg 1993), and have been dealt with in various ways in the ICOP research program. For example, the availability of an EU-wide harmonized survey with quantity and value data at basic prices on product basis (PRODCOM) is an important improvement to international comparability. In addition the number of unit values which can be calculated is much higher than in earlier studies, due to more detailed product data on values and quantities. Finally, the use of secondary sources on prices either derived from business data sources or from industry specific surveys, have helped to reduce the biases in production PPPs. Nevertheless, in some cases expenditure PPPs are still a better choice. In sum, the decision on whether to use an expenditure PPP (with imperfect adjustments) or a production PPP (which is often based on a unit value) is largely an empirical one, and will differ between industries. It may also change over time as new data become available and old data sources are discontinued.

In **Table 3** a qualitative assessment is made of the usefulness of existing sets of expenditure PPPs and production PPPs for 17 major sectors of the economy. Expenditure PPPs are taken from the OECD (1999 round) and production PPPs from the ICOP-project (1997 round) at the University of Groningen. The table reflects our key results from section 2: for an industry in which the share of final expenditure in total use is low, adjusted expenditure PPPs might serve as a bad proxy for domestic output prices (e.g. agriculture, mining, basic manufacturing, transport). A high share of imports in total supply of goods also indicates the possibility of mismeasurement (e.g. durable and non-durable manufacturing) when using expenditure PPPs. However, expenditure PPPs are acceptable proxies for domestic output prices when expenditure shares are high and import ratios low as, for example, is the case in sectors such as construction, hotels and catering and real estate. In the production PPP column we assess the usefulness of the production PPPs. The production PPPs are mainly based on unit value ratios and cover agriculture, mining, manufacturing, transport, communication and trade industries. Their usefulness depends mainly on the severity of the quality problem as discussed above. In the final column of table 3 we indicate our final choice for adjusted expenditure PPPs or ICOP production PPPs in putting together a set of PPPs for deflating gross output at the industry level.

4. Detailed Sources and methods for three-digit PPPs

In this section, we provide an in-depth discussion of the sources and methodologies used to generate the 3-digit PPPs. The discussion is organised by major economic sector: agriculture, mining, manufacturing, public utilities, wholesale and retail trade, transport and communication, and other services. We motivate our choice for the mix of expenditure PPPs and production PPPs, describe the underlying sources and methodologies used for their derivation, including the adjustments made to expenditure PPPs. Occasional reference is made to Appendix Tables 2 and 3, which provide reliability measures of the PPPs for eleven broad sectors and 21 detailed manufacturing industries respectively. For each sector and country, the table shows the number of producer prices or unit value ratios used (in case of production PPPs) and the number of basic headings used (in case of expenditure PPPs). The last column indicates the percentage of gross output covered by the price data.

Agriculture, forestry and fisheries

Agricultural output consists almost exclusively on products used for intermediate input by other firms, not for final consumption. Therefore, expenditure PPPs cannot be used as a proxy for agricultural output PPPs. The agricultural PPPs for this study are developed along the same lines as earlier ICOP work on agriculture (Rao, 1993). We rely exclusively on production PPPs based on producer prices from the FAOSTAT Database of the FAO. This database contains a very

extensive set of quantities and farm-price values of up to 146 agricultural products.¹² The “price received by farmers” in the FAO series refers to the national average prices of individual commodities comprising all grades, kinds and varieties received by farmers at the farm gate or first-point-of-sale.¹³ We computed EKS PPPs for all 25 countries in the dataset for the 3-digit industries crops (ISIC rev 3 industrial code 011) and livestock (012). The average of the PPPs for crops and livestock were used for the other 3-digit industries which are not covered, including fishing and forestry.

Appendix Table 2 shows that output coverage in the agricultural sector is very high. On average about 70% of gross output is covered by our price data. Low coverage is found for Finland and Norway (which have a large fishing sector which is not included in the data), but as high as almost 100% in Greece.

Manufacturing

Compared to other industries, the construction of PPPs for the manufacturing sector has been most common. Most earlier ICOP studies were binary comparisons that were based on censuses and industry surveys, with the matching of products mostly done manually. Some studies have applied multilateralisation procedures, but these were mostly at the level of individual industries or for a limited set of countries (Pilat and Rao, 1996; Rao and Timmer, 2003). The main novelty of the new PPP dataset for manufacturing is the use of PRODCOM, which a harmonized set of product data for European Union member states. PRODCOM greatly enhances the number of product matches on the basis of which unit value ratios (UVRs) were constructed. In addition, the new dataset makes use of adjusted component expenditure PPPs from ICP where appropriate, and applies hedonic UVRs for cars.

Unfortunately it was not possible to create a multilateral dataset for manufacturing at the product-level. This is due to the fact that, except for the EU countries, we do not have a common product listing for all countries involved, as was the case for agriculture.¹⁴ Therefore we opted for a bipolar star system of binaries at the 3-digit industry level, which was multilateralised above the 3-digit level as discussed in section 3.1. The two-star countries are Germany, which was the star for binary comparisons of all EU countries, and the United States, which served as the star country for the other five non-EU countries. These two countries were chosen as these were the countries with the greatest amount of information on products. Subsequently, Germany was linked with the U.S., so that all countries can be (indirectly) compared to each other.

¹² The FAO does not show data for Taiwan and only shows an aggregate for Belgium and Luxembourg for 1997. Data for Taiwan were obtained from the *Statistical Yearbook* and agricultural production statistics, and the figures for Belgium and Luxembourg have been split from the aggregate with the 2002 shares.

¹³ The gross output consists only of the goods that have been supplied on the market, the production of products for own use has been omitted.

¹⁴ In principle, multilateral product PPPs could be derived for countries using the same product classification, as the European countries in the PRODCOM database. But it appeared that the overlap in production structures was often small for quite a number of binary comparisons.

The PRODCOM database, which is available for all “old” EU-15 countries and Norway, includes quantities and sales values by product item, linked to the NACE classification, for up to 7,000 product items. The PRODCOM database is essentially based on the original national production censuses and industry surveys, but uses a harmonized product coding system. Since its start in the mid 1990s, PRODCOM’s coverage has greatly expanded, although there are still some gaps at 3-digit industry level (and also for 2-digit mineral and oil refining).¹⁵

Using the PRODCOM database, production PPPs were made for individual product items. These production PPPs rely on the ratio of the unit value for each matched item with that of Germany, the so-called unit value ratios (UVRs). The new member states of the EU were also matched with Germany based on national census and production survey data. Subsequently the German PRODCOM dataset was matched with data from the *U.S. Census of Manufactures* for 1997. All non-EU countries were directly matched with the U.S. on the basis of national production censuses and industry surveys. For all binaries, Fisher UVRs were computed at the 3-digit level, using quantity weights for the matched products of a country and the base country (the U.S. or Germany).

In addition to the unit value ratios, a set of adjusted expenditure PPPs was constructed for 3-digit industries where UVRs did not suffice. This was the case when no UVRs were available, the UVR was based on less than three matches, or the ‘product quality’ issue was too big for allowing the use of a UVR. Adjusted expenditure PPPs were applied for all 3-digit industries in industries (ISIC rev 3 code) 30 (Office equipment), 33 (Scientific Instruments) and 35 (Other Transport vehicles), but also for some 3-digit industries in 23 (mineral and oil refining) and other durable goods manufacturing (31, 32 and 34). For each 3-digit industry in these major groups, the expenditure PPPs from the International Comparisons Program (ICP) have been browsed for a matching of a PPP at basic heading level. The expenditure PPPs for 1999 have been used as the main source, but 1996 PPPs were considered in case 1999 results could not be used. The expenditure PPPs have been adjusted for trade and transport margins, and for taxes as suggested in section 2.¹⁶ In addition a hedonic production PPP was developed for automobiles for France, Germany, Italy, Japan, UK and the U.S. (see van Mulligen 2003).

¹⁵ The raw PRODCOM data has been cleaned for outliers. All unit values that fell outside the range of 0.2 and 5 times the EU average were removed. This was applied recursive, so the EU average reflects the average of the data which is in the cleaned dataset, not the original one.

¹⁶ The PPPs were adjusted to 1997 with detailed industry deflators from the GGDC 60-industry database. The ICP PPPs were adjusted for Value Added Tax and trade margins. Data on trade margins directly come from the data used for the construction of PPPs for retail and wholesale trade (see below). To make an adjustment for Value Added Tax (VAT), we used product-specific rates from the OECD publication on *Consumption Tax Trends 1999* and the European Commission’s *VAT Rates applied in the Member States of the European Community*.

Appendix Table 3 shows the summary statistics on the number of matches (product UVRs and basic heading expenditure PPPs) used, and their coverage of gross output for each country at a 2-digit industry level. Coverage ratios are generally much higher than in previous ICOP studies due to the additional use of expenditure PPPs. Coverage ratios were up to almost 40% in eight countries including Australia, Canada, Italy and Spain. This is indicated by the third column in Appendix Table 3, which provides the percentage of output covered by the mix of production and expenditure PPPs. The last column in Appendix Table 3 indicates the output coverage by expenditure PPPs alone. Typically, this is less than 7%, but in some cases it can be up to 10%, for example for countries like Australia, Canada, France and Portugal. The comparison for Slovakia entirely relies on expenditure PPPs as no production PPPs could be constructed. The most important difference with previous studies, however, concerns the number of product matches used. Whereas in previous studies, the number of UVRs used was typically below 300, the use of the PRODCOM dataset allowed many more product matches, e.g. more than 1,000 product matches for Italy, and in between 600-800 matches in Denmark, France and the U.K. This indicates that the 'product mix' problem of unit values, which was due to the aggregate nature of past UVRs, is much less in the present study than in the earlier work.

As outlined in section 3.1, the EKS procedure was applied to generate multilateral PPPs at the 2-digit level. The set of binary 3-digit manufacturing production PPPs was aggregated by generating a matrix of Fisher PPPs using the two bridge-countries, Germany and the U.S.. In the weighting procedure from 3-digit to 2-digit level, both gross output and matched output weights were used as described in Section 3.1. For the aggregation of UVRs the choice for the use of matched output or industry output weights is based on the number of matches and the coefficient of variation. If the number of matched products is lower than three or the coefficient of variation is higher than 0.1, matched output is used as the weight. For expenditure PPPs the number of PPPs within a 3-digit sector is mostly lower than three. We therefore used a somewhat different rule: if the output covered by an ICP PPP is lower than 20% of industry output, matched output is used as weight.

Mining

The set-up for mining PPPs is similar to that for manufacturing with a bi-polar star system based on binaries with the the U.S. or Germany. As mining products are almost exclusively used for intermediate consumption, expenditure PPPs are not available and we must exclusively rely on production PPPs. For the old EU-15 countries these are mainly based on PRODCOM data. As the 1997 version of PRODCOM was still rather incomplete, the dataset was extended with matches from other years, which were converted to 1997 prices with industry deflators from the OECD STAN database. The PRODCOM database for European countries was extended by national *Mining or Industrial Surveys* to provide information for some important products that were

missing from PRODCOM.¹⁷ Similar sources were also used to add figures for new member states of the EU and for non-EU countries. For the United States a combination of two sources was used, namely the *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1999*, which contains values and quantities for broad mining products, and the *1997 US Census of Manufactures*, with very detailed product information. For a limited number of items different sources were combined to obtain quantities and values. For example, for large homogenous products that cover a total 3-digit industry like hard coal (10.1), lignite (10.2), peat (10.3), salt (14.4), aggregate industry output values were combined with quantity measures from the *United Nations 2001 Industrial Commodity Statistics Yearbook*.

Compared to previous ICOP studies in mining, the inclusion of mining products from the PRODCOM database has considerably raised the number of product matches to an average of 12 product matches per country with high scores of up to 36 product matches. Average coverage of mining output is about 50% (see Appendix Table 2).

Public Utilities

For derivation of output PPPs for public utilities, production PPPs and expenditure PPPs can in principle both be used as utility output is mostly domestically produced and used for intermediate consumption by firms and final consumption by private customers. Production PPPs have been developed in past studies, but it appeared to be very difficult to find a proper way of matching output value and output quantities. There is no source that contains both production quantity and value data. Hence we relied on a combination of expenditure PPPs for household consumption in combination with new developed PPPs for the intermediate deliveries to industries. The 1999 ICP expenditure PPPs are peeled off for taxes and deflated to 1997. The information about VAT and excise taxes on electricity is obtained from the International Energy Agency's *Energy Prices & Taxes* (2nd quarter 2006)¹⁸. This publication was also the main source for the calculation of PPPs for intermediate consumption by firms. It provides prices for both natural gas and electricity with a distinction between prices for households and for industries. We take the price excluding taxes. The PPP for electricity consumption by firms is therefore calculated as the ex-tax price of country x divided by the ex-tax price of the US. For gas, a different procedure was used. For the United States only the total gas price including taxes was available, which is why we take the total price for natural gas and peel off the taxes to get the PPP. In most cases the government does not levy taxes to industries, or makes them refundable. Only in Canada, Germany, Finland, Japan, Netherlands and Korea industries have to pay non-refundable (excise) taxes.

For water supply (NACE 41) and steam and hot water supply (NACE 40.3) no price data was available to construct an energy PPP for intermediates. Three-digit PPPs for these industries are

¹⁷ To eliminate outliers, the unit values that are not within the range of 5 or 0.2 times the average of all European countries are filtered out.

¹⁸ For missing data, the European Commission (2004) 'VAT rates applied in the European Community' and the OECD (1999) Consumption Tax Trends formed a good back-up.

therefore completely based on peeled ICP PPPs. The tax-rates for the peeling procedure come from the European Commission (2004) ‘VAT rates applied in the European Community’ and deflators are from the GGDC 60-industry database.

The aggregation of energy PPPs for final consumption and intermediate input has been done with final household consumption and intermediate industry use as weights. These weights were taken from Use tables or input-output tables. In most cases the detailed split-up between electricity, gas and water was possible, but if those industries were not separated we used the split up at a higher level (40 or even 40-41).

Appendix Table 2 shows that coverage ratios in the utilities sector are close to 100%, but the number of PPPs differs across countries. Typically there are six PPPs, but for Luxembourg (electricity and gas), and for Denmark, Norway, Portugal and Sweden (only gas) no energy PPP for intermediate use could be calculated. This means that the respective PPPs are also only based on the household PPP. For Taiwan no ICP PPPs were available, so the PPPs are purely based on UVRs from the ICPA project. Given developments in the energy markets in many countries, one of the challenges for the future is a split in utilities between the production and the distribution of electricity, gas and water. So far, this type of data is lacking.

Wholesale and Retail Trade

Comparisons of prices in services industries are complicated by the fact that the output concept is often not unambiguously defined, and a price per unit of output is therefore difficult to develop. The distributive industry has an additional complication. Gross output of distribution industries can be measured in terms of sales or turnover¹⁹, which is the concept mostly used for industries other than trade, or as the margin value (sales minus cost of goods sold). In countries’ national accounts, trade output is defined as margin value. It therefore measures the services delivered by making goods available at alternative places and times, without modification of the product itself. The correct price for deflation of trade output would therefore be margin prices. A margin price represents the price a consumer pays for a unit of trade services. However, whereas the sales price of a good of service can be directly measured, the margin price is much more difficult to determine. The direct measurement of margin prices, taking the difference between the price of the good received when it is sold to the consumer and the price of the same good when purchased by the trade firm, is only being experimented with by some national statistical institutes. Most NSIs use the so-called “sales-indicator method”, using deflated sales as an indicator for margin volumes, taking into account changes in the margin-to-sales ratios over time.

Until recently international comparisons of the distribution sector used a single deflation method, based on the use of expenditure PPPs (retail sales prices).. The approach adopted in this study is different, as it aims to mimic the procedure for the deflation of output in trade services in national

¹⁹ Adjusted for inventory changes.

accounts. In contrast to single deflation, the sales-indicator method makes use of differences in the margin-to-sales ratios between countries. The crucial assumption is that sales transactions represent the same quantity of trade services in both countries. Obviously this is a strong assumption as service quality levels can differ between countries, even for the same set of goods and type of outlet. However, without detailed information on service quality levels, this assumption is necessary to separate prices and quantities and proxy a double deflated PPP (which separately deflates sales and purchases) as good as possible. The method sales-indicator method is superior to single-deflated measures.²⁰ A full scale double deflation procedure, which provides independent measures of sales and purchase prices, is still too difficult to implement empirically at this moment (but see van Ark et al, 1999; van Ark and Timmer, 2001 for early attempts).

The available price data is different for the wholesale and retail industries. In the case of retail, expenditure PPPs for individual expenditure categories were directly applied to sales output. The PPP at margin level is derived as a weighted average of the sales PPP of all goods, corrected for differences in margin-to-sales ratios between two countries. In the case of wholesale trade, only prices of goods purchased by the wholesale sector are observable. In this case, margin PPPs are derived by adjusting for differences in margin-to-cost ratios between two countries.

Information on retail and wholesale sales, purchases and margins were obtained from national trade census and survey data at 3- or 4 digit level. Expenditure PPPs for retail sales were available from the International Comparisons Program (ICP) for 1999. These expenditure PPPs were allocated to 4-digit retail industries on the basis of their presumed retail trade channel.²¹ The prices of goods purchased by the wholesale industry are obtained through the output price of the domestic producer of these goods. Relative output prices for agricultural and manufacturing goods are obtained from the measures in the present database, as discussed above. Two-digit manufacturing industries have been linked to each of the wholesale industries on the basis of their importance in wholesale industry purchases.

In Appendix Table 2, one can see that for more than sixty 4-digit trade industries margin PPPs could be calculated for most binary comparisons. This is due to a fine level of industry-detail, which is important given the fact that margin prices differ considerably across trade industries (Timmer and Ypma, 2006).

²⁰ See Timmer and Ypma (2006) for an elaborate discussion

²¹ The 1999 expenditure PPPs are converted to 1997 on the basis of price deflators from the GGDC 60-industry database. expenditure PPPs are corrected for deductible VAT or sales tax by using the OECD *Consumption Tax Trends 1999* and *VAT Rates Applied in the Member States of the European Union* from the European Commission. To get a total sales tax rate for the United States, state rates have been weighted with their share in U.S. GDP, providing a weighted sales tax of 5.3%. We also made an adjustment for excise taxes in the case of fuels sale. For other products with large excise taxes such as tobacco and alcohol, differences between countries are relatively small and no adjustment has been made.

Transport and Communication

In transport a large share of services are used for intermediate consumption and international trade. There is also a clear difference in the product mix of transport services used by private households and businesses. For example, trucking and shipping services are mostly for intermediate use, whereas bus services are mainly for final consumption. The usefulness of expenditure PPPs for the transport sector is therefore limited, and we relied rather exclusively on UVRs, following previous ICOP-research. In the transportation sector, activities are divided in passenger transport (train, bus, domestic air and international air) and goods transport (train, truck, domestic air, international air, coastal shipping and ocean shipping). Passenger-kilometres and ton-kilometres were the most frequently available measures for quantities.

The key challenge in transport and communication is to match value and quantity data from the same source in order to ensure consistency. This could be done for the railway sector, for which the *World Bank Railway Database* was used, containing data for many countries. For the air transportation sector both quantities and values were obtained from the *Civil Aviation Statistics of the World 1997* of the ICAO. For the other land transportation and water transport, various sources needed to be combined. The *Annual Bulletin of Statistics for Europe and North America 1999* of the United Nations was the main source for the quantity data, while value data mostly stems from detailed national sources, the OECD *Industry and Statistics* database or Eurostat *Structural Business Statistics*.

In previous work, a special adjustment was made for terminal services. Because terminal services (ports, airports, stations) could not be distinguished from movement services, a terminal adjustment was made for each transportation mode, using adjustment factors which were obtained from the inverse of the ratio of relative average distances travelled (van Ark *et al.*, 1999). Fortunately, the change in industrial classification from ISIC rev. 2 to rev. 3 allowed for the creation of a separate new industry for handling services (ISIC rev. 3 63). For cargo handling and storage (63.1 and 63.4) and other supporting transport activities (63.2), measures of tonnages and passenger numbers could be used to measure quantities. Value data for the various types of supporting services were obtained by assuming that the shares of transport of persons and freight in gross output by transport mode were also applicable to supporting services for rail, road and air transport.²²

For the communications sector, a similar approach was used as for transport. Communication activities are divided into postal activities and telecommunication. In previous work, typically only two service activities were taken into account (postal deliveries and number of phone calls), but in this study this was expanded to 10 activities. We made use of two databases with both quantities and values. The postal sector is described in the *Universal Postal Database 2004* of the Universal Postal Union. This database contains various quantity measures (domestic and

²² See Ypma (2006) for an elaborate discussion.

international letter post, registered items, insured letters, newspapers, parcels) for the postal sector in developed countries, as well as the operating revenue of the postal sector. Measures of the number of local and national calls, international called minutes and cellular subscribers as well as the revenue from these services was obtained from OECD's *Telecommunication Database 2003*.

In Appendix Table 2 one can see that typically twenty or more UVRs have been used to derive the output PPP for the transportation and communications sector, covering about 60% or more of gross output in this industry. This is a major improvement compared to previous work. However, a major challenge for the future is the need to take international differences in the quality of transport and communication services into account (see, for example, O'Mahony and Oulton 2000).

Other Services

For a range of service industries, no production PPPs are available as yet and we had to rely solely on adjusted expenditure PPPs.²³ We adopted a disaggregated approach by obtaining ICP PPP for individual 3-digit industries.²⁴ Almost all ICP basic headings could be allocated to one or more 3-digit industries. In some cases we used an ICP PPP for more than one sector, because the PPP was too broad for one 3-digit PPP.²⁵ Still it has to be stressed that the usefulness of expenditure PPPs differ greatly across industries. For example, adjusted expenditure PPPs provide a very good proxy for the PPPs for gross output in the construction, hotels and restaurants, and real estate activities as almost all output of these industries is for final expenditure, with very little export and import activity. Consequently, coverage ratios are very high, see Appendix Table 2.²⁶

For other industries, expenditure PPPs are poor proxies. For community, social and personal services only nine PPPs could be found, covering 50 to 80 % of output. This is due to the fact that a sizeable share of these services is used for intermediate, not final consumption. Furthermore the mix of services used by producers will differ considerably from the services used by final consumers. One might argue that the products in this industry fall into two categories: products for final consumption for which the expenditure PPP should be a good proxy (case 1 in Table 2),

²³ There have been some attempts to derive unit values for these sectors, by using quantity measures such as number of houses built (for construction), number of students (for education) or size of M2 money supply (for finance) (see Pilat, 1994; and Mulder, 2002). However, we deem these proxies to be too crude to apply widely across countries.

²⁴ As for previous sectors, PPPs were converted to 1997 with value added deflators from the GGDC 60-industry database. The PPPs were also adjusted for value added taxes (or sales taxes in the U.S.), taking into account tax exemptions of some service industries.

²⁵ The basic heading system of ICP is based on internationally harmonized classifications, such as the (H)ICP (Household consumption categories), COFOG (Classification of Government functions) and COPNI (Non-profit institutions functions), so detailed descriptions could be used to match expenditure PPPs and industries.

²⁶ Coverage ratios for adjusted expenditure PPPs are calculated as nominal consumption from ICP over gross output.

and products of intermediate use for which no expenditure PPP is available (case 2 in Table 2). This situation is also typical for business services, which output is mainly destined for other firms.

The expenditure PPPs for finance, public administration, education and health bear little relation with output prices. The expenditure PPP for finance is a reference PPP, which is based on the overall expenditure PPP, rather than on relative prices of financial services. Given the way in which financial output is currently deflated in most national accounts, this practice is perhaps defensible. Expenditure PPPs for the other sectors are mainly PPPs for inputs. However, as long as output of these sectors in the national accounts is also measured by inputs (costs) only, these PPPs have at least some validity.

For the R&D industry (73), no specific ICP PPP was available, but a PPP could be obtained from an R&D cost-based study by Dougherty et al. (2006), which obtains separate PPPs for the compensation of R&D workers combined with an aggregate GDP PPPs for other cost categories.

5. Comparisons of industry output prices and relative price levels

There is a wide range of applications of gross output PPPs for research in economics. As discussed in the introduction, one of the main applications is in sectoral price and productivity studies. In this section we focus on a comparison of relative price levels for 1997. A relative price level is defined as the ratio of a PPP by the official exchange rate. Relative price levels above one indicate that the output price of the industry in a particular country, converted at the exchange rate, is higher than the output price in the base country, in this case the U.S.

Table 4 presents the relative price levels for all 25 countries relative to the U.S. at the broad level of ten major sectors. The countries are ranked in ascending order on their GDP per capita level in 1997. The results suggest considerable price differences between sectors and countries. Summary statistics on the average of relative price levels and the coefficient of variation in relative price levels between countries are given in the bottom rows. We divided the countries into two groups: “low” income countries (from Poland to Spain), and “high” income (from Ireland to Luxembourg). A number of general observations can be made.

For agriculture relative price levels vary widely. This sector has the highest coefficient of variation of all ten sectors. This is mainly due to high price levels in the agricultural sectors in Japan, Norway and South Korea which are characterized by high protection level. For example, in Japan agricultural prices are almost five times prices in the U.S. and more than three times in France.

Manufacturing price levels are much closer together as indicated by the coefficient of variation which is the lowest of all sectors (0.21). While relative prices in manufacturing are quite high in Austria, Japan and Norway and much higher than in the U.S., they are particularly low in the Eastern European countries, at typically 60 to 70% of the U.S. level. This variance might come as a surprise. One of the cornerstones in international trade theory is the so-called *Law of One Price*: the price of an internationally traded good should be the same anywhere in the world once that price is expressed in a common currency. This law is based on an international goods arbitrage argument: in case prices of goods would differ, a riskless profit could be made by shipping them from countries where the price is low to countries where the price is high. This law is the foundation of the *PPP hypothesis* which states that the nominal exchange rate between two currencies should be equal to the ratio of aggregate price levels between the two countries, hence the relative price level should be one. However, there are many reasons for the PPP hypothesis not to hold in the short run, including volatile exchange rate behaviour and the many barriers to arbitrage which include tariff and non-tariff barriers, transport costs, product differentiation and price discrimination (Anderson and Wincoop, 2004). In general there is consensus that PPP should hold in the long run, but not necessarily in the short run (Taylor and Taylor, 2004). Our finding suggests indeed that PPP did not hold true for manufacturing goods in the OECD in 1997.

Also for detailed manufacturing industries PPP does not hold true. In **Table 5**, relative prices levels for twenty-two two digit manufacturing industries are given, including, in the last columns of the table, the coefficient of variation for each manufacturing industry. Prices show a particularly high variance across countries in Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel, Rubber and plastics products and Non-metallic mineral products, while in more basic industries like Pulp, paper and paper products and Basic metals price variance is the lowest. Further research that links the characteristics of these industries to the impact on international trade costs seems to be a promising avenue for explaining the industry-level variances and can provide new insight into the role of transaction costs in international trade.

Another standard assumption in international trade theory is the Balassa-Samuelson hypothesis which states that relative prices of non-traded products between countries should be larger than for traded products. This is especially true the further apart countries are in terms of their productivity. This phenomenon has been reported on the basis of expenditure PPP work in ICP, where it was found that relative expenditure prices for services in less developed countries are typically much lower than relative expenditure prices for manufactured goods. Our data confirms this regularity from an industry perspective. For less developed countries, PPPs for output of services sector (see the last column of Table 4) is typically well below one (which is the US level). On average, low income countries have a services output price level of 0.65 relative to the U.S., while high income countries show a relative price level of 1.10 on average. This range is much larger than for manufacturing output. On average, for low income countries the manufacturing price level is 0.82 while for services 0.65. For high income countries, there is almost no difference (1.15 versus 1.10). The lower output prices in less advanced countries is

notably true for the construction industry, for public services and for other services. For distributive trade and for transport and communication industries relative prices are much higher. This provides further support for the Balassa-Samuelson hypothesis as it predicts that the price differences will be bigger in sectors with higher intensity of labour. Arguably, sectors such as construction, public services and other services are more labour-intensive than other services industries.

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper we set out to derive a new database on PPPs for gross output at the industry level, covering the total economy for OECD countries. In principle, production PPPs best reflect relative producer output prices. However, due to data limitations, production PPPs are only available for a restrictive set of products and industries. For complete coverage of the economy, production PPPs must be combined with expenditure PPPs from the OECD. Such expenditure PPPs need to be adjusted to reflect relative output prices. To support an optimal strategy in selecting production and expenditure PPPs, we derived the relationship between expenditure prices and output prices by applying a Supply and Use-table framework. We found that three types of adjustments are needed to derive an output price from a final domestic demand price: an adjustment for margins and taxes, an adjustment for international trade and an adjustment for intermediate consumption. In practice only the first adjustment is often made. As a result, expenditure PPPs can be biased, depending on the share of international trade and intermediate consumption in total demand. Based on the SUT framework, we motivate our mix of expenditure and production PPPs for each industry in compiling a dataset covering the total economy. We show the potential of this new database by a study of relative industry prices in the OECD region. It was found that PPP does not hold within the OECD, not even in manufacturing industries: relative prices differ considerably across countries. The biggest variance is found for output price levels in services, confirming the Balassa-Samuelson hypothesis.

A number of issues stand out for future research. First of all, the PPPs for output presented here need to be complemented by PPPs for labour, capital and intermediate inputs. Only then comparisons can be made of value added and total factor productivity across countries in a full scale KLEMS framework along the lines of Jorgenson, Kuroda and Nishimizu (1987), taking account all inputs of production. Inklaar and Timmer (2006) provide a pilot study for seven OECD countries for the year 1997, which will be extended to more countries in the framework of the EU KLEMS project.

Second, the industry PPPs provide a potential alternative for deflation of aggregate GDP. By aggregating industry-level gross output PPPs in an input-output framework, a PPP for GDP can be derived from the production side. These production PPPs for GDP can be compared with

existing expenditure PPP for GDP from ICP. Building up a consistent set of industry level output PPPs and product level expenditure PPPs in a supply- and use-framework can deliver new insights into the reliability and consistency of the various PPPs. Issues which need to be addressed include the deflation of intermediate inputs, imports and exports, and the treatment of net taxes on products.

Finally, it should be recognised that although this paper represents the first attempt to construct a comprehensive and large-scale set of PPPs for industry-level output, its future looks bleak. This is mainly due to the large budget cuts by NSI's which leads to a reduction in the provision of information on products, which is needed to derive production PPPs. Surveys of production spend less and less resources on collection product-level information on quantities produced. For example, the number of products for which quantity data is shown in the U.S. *Census of manufacturing* has dramatically declined from the year 1997 to 2002. The future of the European PRODCM database, which is the main building block for production PPPs for manufacturing industries, is also uncertain. This would mean that future updates of this database must increasingly rely on adjusted expenditure PPPs. This stresses the importance of the main theoretical results in this paper.

References

- Anderson, J.E. and E. van Wincoop (2004), *Trade Costs*, NBER Working Paper no. 10480.
- Ark, B. van (1996), "Issues in Measurement and International Comparison of Productivity – An Overview", in OECD, *Industry Productivity. International Comparisons and Measurement Issues*, Paris: OECD, pp. 19-47.
- Ark, B. van, E. Monnikhof, and N. Mulder (1999), "Productivity in Services: An international Comparative Perspective", *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 32(2), pp.471-99.
- Ark, B. van and M.P. Timmer (2001), "PPPs and International Productivity Comparisons: Bottlenecks and New Directions", paper for Joint World Bank-OECD seminar on Purchasing Power Parties, 30 January – 2 February, Washington D.C. (downloadable from www.oecd.org/dataoecd/24/0/2424747.pdf)
- Bernard, A.B. and C.I. Jones (2001), "Comparing Apples To Oranges: Productivity Convergence and Measurement Across Industries And Countries: Reply", *American Economic Review*, September, 91(4), pp. 1168-1169.
- Broadberry, S.N. (1997), *The Productivity Race. British Manufacturing in International Perspective, 1850-1990*, Cambridge University Press.

- Broadberry, S.N. (2003) "Relative per capita income levels in the United Kingdom and the United States since 1870: reconciling time-series projections and direct-benchmark estimates", *Journal of Economic History*, 63 (3), pp. 852-63.
- Canzoneri, M.B., R.E. Cumby and B. Diba (1999), "Relative labor productivity and the real exchange rate in the long run: evidence for a panel of OECD countries", *Journal of International Economics*, no. 47 , pp. 245–266.
- Dougherty, Sean D., R. Inklaar, R.H. McGuckin and B.van Ark (2006), "International Comparisons of R&D Expenditure: Does an R&D PPP Make a Difference?", in E.R. Berndt and C.M. Hulten, eds., *Hard-to-Measure Goods and Services: Essays in Honor of Zvi Griliches*, NBER/CRIW, The University of Chicago Press.
- Drechsler, L. (1973), "Weighting of index numbers in multilateral international comparisons", *Review of Income and Wealth*, series 19, No. 1, March.
- Elteto, O. and P. Koves (1964), "On an Index Computation Problem in International Comparisons" (in Hungarian), *Statistikai Szemle*, Vol. 42, pp. 507-518.
- Groningen Growth and Development Centre, 60-Industry Database, October 2005, <http://www.ggdc.net>
- Goldberg, P.K and F. Verboven (2004), "Cross-country price dispersion in the euro era: a case study of the European car market", *Economic Policy*, no. 40, October.
- Griffith, R., Redding, S, and J. aan Reenen, John (2004), "Mapping the Two Faces of R&D: Productivity Growth in a Panel of OECD Industries", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, v. 86, iss. 4, pp. 883-95
- Harrigan, J. (1999), "Estimation of cross-country differences in industry production functions", *Journal of International Economics*, vol.47, pp. 267-293.
- Heston, A., R. Summers and B. Aten (2002), "Penn World Table Version 6.1", Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania (CICUP), October.
- Hooper, P. and E. Vrankovich (1995), "International Comparisons of the Level of Unit Labor Costs in Manufacturing", in *International Finance Papers*, No. 527, Federal Reserve Board, Washington D.C.
- Inklaar, R., M. O'Mahony, K. Robinson and M.P. Timmer (2003), *Chapter 7* in O'Mahony, Mary and Bart van Ark, eds. (2003), *EU Productivity and Competitiveness: An Industry Perspective Can Europe Resume the Catching-up Process?* Office for Official Publications of the European Communities: Luxembourg.
- Inklaar, Robert, Mary O'Mahony and Marcel P. Timmer (2005), "ICT and Europe's Productivity Performance; Industry-level Growth Account Comparisons with the United States" *Review of Income and Wealth*, 51(4), pp. 505-36.
- Inklaar, Robert, and Marcel P. Timmer (2006), "International Comparisons of Industry Output, Inputs and Productivity Levels: Methodology and New Results" paper prepared for the

Intermediate Input-Output Meetings 2006 on Sustainability, Trade & Productivity in Sendai, Japan.

- Jorgenson, D.W., (1993), "Productivity Levels in Germany, Japan, and the United States: Differences and Causes: Comment" *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Microeconomics 1993*, pp. 49-56
- Jorgenson, D.W., M. Kuroda and M. Nishimizu (1987), "Japan-U.S. Industry-level Productivity Comparisons, 1960-1979", *Journal of the Japanese and International Economics*, vol. 1, 1-30.
- Kravis, I.B., A. Heston and R. Summers (1982), *World Product and Income*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Lee, F.C. and Y. Tang (2001), "Productivity Levels and International Competitiveness between Canada and the US", in Jorgenson and Lee (ed.) (2001).
- Lichtenberg, F. R. (1993) "Productivity Levels in Germany, Japan, and the United States: Differences and Causes: Comment" *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Microeconomics 1993*, pp. 56-61
- Maddison, A. (2001), *The World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*, OECD, Paris.
- Maddison, A. (2005), *Growth and Interaction in the World Economy: The Roots of Modernity*, The AEI Press, Washington, D.C.
- Maddison, A. and B. van Ark (2002), "The International Comparison of Real Product and Productivity," in A. Maddison, D.S. Prasada Rao and W.F. Shepherd, eds., *The Asian Economies in the Twentieth Century*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 5-26.
- Mulder, N. (2002), *The Economic Performance of the Service Sector in Brazil, Mexico and the USA, A Comparative Historical Perspective*, Aldershot UK and Brookfield US: Edward Elgar.
- Mulligen, P.H. Van (2002), *Quality Differences And Hedonic Pricing In International Comparisons*, Ph.D. Thesis, University Of Groningen.
- OECD (1999), *Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures – EKS Results, 1996*, Paris.
- OECD (2000), *Purchasing Power Parities and Real Expenditures, 1999 Benchmark Year*, OECD, Paris.
- O'Mahony, M. (1996), "Conversion Factors in Relative Productivity Calculations: Theory and Practice", in OECD, *Industry Productivity. International Comparisons and Measurement Issues*, Paris: OECD, pp. 245-262.
- O'Mahony (1999), *Britain's Productivity Performance 1950-1996 – An International Perspective*, National Institute of Economic and Social Research, London.

- O'Mahony and N. Oulton (2000), "International Comparisons of Labour Productivity in Transport and Communications: The US, the UK and Germany", *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 14, 7–30.
- Pilat, D. (1994), *The Economics of Rapid Growth. The Experience of Japan and Korea*, Aldershot UK and Brookfield US: Edward Elgar.
- Pilat, D. (1996), *Labour productivity levels in OECD countries: estimates for manufacturing and selected service sectors*, OECD Economics Department Working Papers no. 169, Paris.
- Pilat, D. and D.S. Prasada Rao (1996), "Multilateral Comparisons of Output, Productivity, and Purchasing Power Parities in Manufacturing," *Review of Income and Wealth*, 42(2), pp. 113-30.
- Prasada Rao, D.S (1993), *Intercountry Comparisons of Agricultural Output and Productivity*, FAO Economic and Social Development Paper, Rome.
- Prasada Rao, D.S. and M.P.Timmer (2003), "Purchasing Power Parities for Industry Comparisons Using Weighted Elteto-Koves-Szulc (EKS) Methods", *The Review of Income and Wealth*, 49(4), pp. 491-512.
- Rogoff, K. (1996), "The Purchasing Power Parity Puzzle", *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 34, pp. 647-668.
- Summers, R. and A. Heston (1991), "The Penn World Table (Mark 5): An Expanded Set of International Comparisons, 1950-1988" *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 1991, v. 106, iss. 2, pp. 327-68.
- Szulc, B. (1964), "Index Numbers of Multilateral Regional Comparisons" (in Polish), *Przegląd Statystyczny*, Vol.3, 239-254.
- Szirmai, A. and D. Pilat (1990), "Comparisons of Purchasing Power, Real Output and Labour Productivity in Manufacturing in Japan, South Korea and the USA, 1975-1985", *Review of Income and Wealth*, 36(1), pp.1-31.
- Taylor, A.M. and M.P. Taylor (2004). "The Purchasing Power Parity Debate", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, v. 18, iss. 4, pp. 135-58.
- Timmer, Marcel P. (2000), *The Dynamics of Asian Manufacturing. A Comparative Perspective in the late Twentieth Century*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham
- Timmer, M.P. and G. Ypma (2006), *Productivity Levels in Distributive Trades: A New ICOP Dataset for OECD Countries*, Groningen Growth and Development Centre GD-83 (April 2006)
- Ward, M. and Devereux, J. (2003) 'Measuring British decline: direct versus long-span income measures', *Journal of Economic History*, 63 (3), pp. 826-51.
- Ypma, G. (2006), *PPPs for Transport and Communication*, Groningen Growth and Development Centre GD-86 (forthcoming)

Table 1 - Outline of Supply and Use Table

USE table at purchasers' prices

| | Industries 1 ... j ... n | Total interme- diate use | Final domestic demand | Exports fob | Total use at purchasers' price |
|---|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Commodities | 1 : i : m ... $P_{Xij}X_{ij}$... | VX_i | $P_{Fi}F_i$ | $P_{Ei}E_i$ | $VX_i+VF_i+VE_i$ |
| Total intermediate input at purchasers' price | ... VX_j ... | VX | VF | VE | $VX+VF+VE$ |
| Gross value added at basic price | ... GVA_j ... | | | | |
| Gross output at basic prices | ... VY_j ... | | | | |

SUPPLY table at basic prices

| | Industries 1 ... j ... n | Total domestic supply | Import cif | Total supply at basic prices | Taxes minus subsidies | Trade and transport margins | Total supply at purchasers' prices |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Commodities | 1 : i : m ... $P_{Yij}Y_{ij}$... | VY_i | $P_{Mi}M_i$ | $VS_i= VY_i + VM_i$ | t_iVS_i | r_iVS_i | $(1+t_i+r_i)VS_i$ |
| Total at basic price | ... VY_j ... | VY | VM | $VS= VY + VM$ | T | R | $VS+R+T$ |

Table 2 Bias in adjusted final expenditure price as a proxy for domestic output price

| | <i>No int. trade</i> | <i>Only Export</i> | <i>Only Import</i> | <i>Both</i> |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| <i>Only Final use</i> | (1) 0 | (4) $A^{E,M} < 0$ | (7) $A^{E,M} > 0$ | (10) ? |
| <i>Only Intermediate use</i> | (2) n.a. | (5) n.a. | (8) n.a. | (11) n.a. |
| <i>Both uses</i> | (3) $A^X < 0$ | (6) $A^{E,M} + A^X < 0$ | (9) ? | (12) ? |

Table 3: Assessment of usefulness of adjusted expenditure PPPs and production PPPs for industry output comparisons in the OECD

| <i>Industry</i> | ISIC rev. 3 code | Grade | | Remark | | |
|---|------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| | | Adjusted expenditure PPP | Production PPP | Adjusted expenditure PPP | Production PPP | Final choice in this database |
| Agriculture | 01-05 | 0 | 5 | Not available | - | production |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 0 | 4 | Not available | - | production |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | | | | | |
| <i>Food, drink & tobacco</i> | 15,16 | 3 | 4 | Trade intensive | - | Mainly production |
| <i>Basic goods</i> | 17,20,21,23-28 | 1 | 4 | Small expenditure share | - | Mainly production |
| <i>Non-durable</i> | 18,19,22,36,37 | 2 | 4 | Trade intensive | - | Mainly production |
| <i>Durable</i> | 29-35 | 2 | 2 | Trade intensive | Quality problem | production/expenditure |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40,41 | 3 | 2 | Low expenditure share | Quantity problem | expenditure/production |
| Construction | 45 | 4 | 0 | - | Not available | expenditure |
| Trade | 50-52 | 0 | 2 | Not available | Quality problem | production |
| Hotels & catering | 55 | 4 | 0 | - | Not available | expenditure |
| Transport | 60-63 | 1 | 3 | Small expenditure share | Quality problem | production |
| Communications | 64 | 2 | 3 | Small expenditure share | Quality problem | production |
| Finance | 65-67 | 1 | 0 | Reference PPP | Not available | expenditure |
| Real estate activities | 70 | 4 | 0 | - | Not available | expenditure |
| Business services | 71-74 | 1 | 0 | Small expenditure share | Not available | expenditure |
| Public administration and defence, education and health | 75, 80,85 | 1 | 0 | Mainly based on input PPPs | Not available | expenditure |
| Other services | 90-95 | 2 | 0 | Small expenditure share | Not available | expenditure |

Note: ranking indicates 0 (not available), 1 (very poor), 2 (poor), 3 (acceptable), 4 (useful) and 5 (very useful).

Source: assessment based on expenditure PPPs for OECD from 1999 round and production PPPs for 1997 from Groningen Growth and Development Centre, ICOP-project, see section 4.

Table 4 Relative price levels for gross output (US = 1), broad sectors, 1997

| <i>Industry ISIC rev. 3</i> | Agricul- ture 01-05 | Mining 10-14 | Manufac- turing 15-37 | Utilities 40-41 | Construc- tion 45 | Trade 50-55 | Transport and Communi- cation 60-64 | Financial and business services 65-74 | Other services 90-95 | Public services 75-85 | Services sector average 50-95 |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Poland | 0.80 | 0.71 | 0.67 | 0.57 | 0.45 | 0.53 | 0.62 | 0.37 | 0.36 | 0.20 | 0.41 |
| Slovakia | 0.96 | 1.72 | 0.71 | 0.40 | 0.35 | 0.48 | 0.58 | 0.30 | 0.26 | 0.17 | 0.36 |
| Hungary | 0.84 | 0.67 | 0.68 | 1.04 | 0.56 | 0.63 | 0.57 | 0.36 | 0.29 | 0.18 | 0.41 |
| Czech Republic | 0.95 | 0.73 | 0.65 | 0.69 | 0.36 | 0.50 | 0.69 | 0.44 | 0.33 | 0.16 | 0.42 |
| South Korea | 2.28 | 1.49 | 1.02 | 0.98 | 0.77 | 1.05 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.73 | 0.42 | 0.81 |
| Taiwan | 1.94 | 2.26 | 0.80 | 0.94 | 0.57 | 1.08 | 1.14 | 1.08 | 0.65 | 1.15 | 1.02 |
| Greece | 1.79 | 1.66 | 1.07 | 1.03 | 0.73 | 1.18 | 1.26 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.47 | 0.89 |
| Portugal | 1.30 | 1.55 | 1.04 | 1.39 | 0.59 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.46 | 0.67 |
| Spain | 1.24 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 1.16 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 1.06 | 0.81 | 0.95 | 0.61 | 0.85 |
| Ireland | 1.32 | 1.52 | 1.19 | 1.53 | 1.06 | 0.96 | 1.43 | 0.97 | 0.89 | 0.77 | 1.00 |
| Finland | 1.69 | 1.40 | 1.14 | 1.18 | 0.73 | 1.01 | 1.25 | 1.34 | 1.21 | 0.89 | 1.14 |
| Sweden | 1.30 | 1.87 | 1.27 | 0.83 | 1.31 | 1.37 | 1.02 | 1.38 | 1.18 | 0.93 | 1.18 |
| Italy | 1.49 | 1.18 | 0.95 | 1.09 | 0.85 | 1.17 | 1.24 | 0.83 | 1.05 | 0.75 | 1.01 |
| Germany | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.15 | 1.42 | 1.31 | 0.95 | 1.30 | 1.20 | 1.07 | 0.93 | 1.09 |
| Canada | 1.05 | 0.78 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 0.91 | 0.76 | 0.97 | 0.85 | 0.69 | 0.84 |
| U.K. | 1.41 | 1.44 | 1.20 | 1.34 | 1.10 | 1.21 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 1.12 | 0.74 | 1.03 |
| France | 1.34 | 1.53 | 1.22 | 1.27 | 1.40 | 1.06 | 1.20 | 1.38 | 1.14 | 0.84 | 1.12 |
| Australia | 1.04 | 0.85 | 1.12 | 0.98 | 0.87 | 1.20 | 0.96 | 1.07 | 1.03 | 0.69 | 0.99 |
| Belgium | 1.27 | 1.39 | 1.08 | 1.46 | 1.03 | 0.97 | 1.45 | 1.04 | 1.09 | 0.81 | 1.07 |
| Austria | 1.22 | 2.20 | 1.35 | 1.45 | 1.11 | 1.15 | 1.49 | 1.20 | 1.16 | 0.87 | 1.17 |
| Netherlands | 1.33 | 0.98 | 1.14 | 1.45 | 1.29 | 0.91 | 0.84 | 1.06 | 1.01 | 0.70 | 0.91 |
| Japan | 4.86 | 2.38 | 1.50 | 1.96 | 1.57 | 2.07 | 1.72 | 2.10 | 1.74 | 1.00 | 1.72 |
| Denmark | 1.30 | 1.87 | 1.28 | 1.66 | 1.32 | 1.05 | 1.40 | 1.18 | 1.13 | 0.96 | 1.14 |
| U.S. | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Norway | 2.00 | 2.05 | 1.40 | 0.82 | 1.16 | 1.33 | 1.79 | 1.27 | 1.45 | 0.96 | 1.36 |
| Luxembourg | 1.31 | 1.32 | 1.18 | 1.31 | 1.24 | 0.95 | 0.98 | 0.86 | 1.07 | 1.05 | 0.98 |
| average, all | 1.47 | 1.41 | 1.06 | 1.15 | 0.94 | 1.01 | 1.10 | 0.98 | 0.93 | 0.71 | 0.95 |
| average, low | 1.34 | 1.29 | 0.83 | 0.91 | 0.58 | 0.79 | 0.86 | 0.62 | 0.56 | 0.42 | 0.65 |
| average, high | 1.54 | 1.47 | 1.18 | 1.27 | 1.12 | 1.13 | 1.23 | 1.17 | 1.13 | 0.86 | 1.10 |
| coef of var, all | 0.53 | 0.36 | 0.22 | 0.31 | 0.36 | 0.31 | 0.30 | 0.39 | 0.38 | 0.41 | 0.32 |

Table 5 Relative price levels for gross output (US = 1), manufacturing industries, 1997

| | | Czech | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------|---------|----------|---------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|
| | ISIC rev. 3 | Austria | Belgium | Republic | Denmark | Finland | France | Germany | Greece | Hungary |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 1.16 | 1.01 | 0.60 | 1.07 | 1.20 | 1.20 | 1.02 | 1.22 | 0.58 |
| Textiles | 17 | 1.94 | 0.79 | 0.60 | 1.49 | 1.18 | 1.23 | 1.36 | 1.00 | 0.66 |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 2.51 | 1.57 | 1.06 | 1.43 | 1.98 | 2.66 | 1.92 | 1.36 | 0.82 |
| Leather | 19 | 1.43 | 1.32 | 0.68 | 1.32 | 1.43 | 1.04 | 1.33 | 1.15 | 0.63 |
| Wood products | 20 | 1.55 | 1.32 | 0.55 | 1.34 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.20 | 0.78 | 0.58 |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 0.96 | 0.81 | 0.57 | 1.05 | 0.90 | 1.09 | 0.98 | 1.12 | 0.66 |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 1.24 | 1.11 | 1.12 | 2.16 | 1.03 | 1.43 | 1.24 | 0.65 | 0.48 |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and | 23 | 1.53 | 1.27 | 0.87 | 1.67 | 1.39 | 1.10 | 1.08 | 1.08 | 1.08 |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.44 | 1.08 | 0.64 | 1.02 | 0.98 | 0.67 | 0.62 |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 0.75 | 0.57 | 0.37 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 0.74 | 0.84 | 1.00 | 0.44 |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 0.93 | 0.73 | 0.33 | 1.10 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.85 | 0.52 | 0.42 |
| Basic metals | 27 | 1.33 | 0.95 | 0.64 | 1.16 | 1.20 | 1.06 | 0.98 | 0.78 | 0.67 |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 1.62 | 1.12 | 0.51 | 1.39 | 0.85 | 1.12 | 1.21 | 0.82 | 0.59 |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 1.49 | 1.11 | 0.61 | 1.23 | 1.08 | 1.07 | 1.12 | 0.78 | 0.38 |
| Office, accounting and computing mac | 30 | 0.87 | 0.92 | 0.55 | 1.33 | 1.17 | 0.85 | 0.97 | 0.72 | 0.66 |
| Other electrical machinery and appara | 31 | 1.09 | 1.08 | 0.63 | 2.34 | 0.98 | 1.29 | 1.16 | 0.73 | 0.56 |
| Radio, television and communication e | 32 | 1.85 | 1.31 | 0.66 | 1.51 | 1.55 | 1.26 | 1.42 | 1.36 | 0.78 |
| Instruments | 33 | 1.36 | 1.41 | 0.58 | 1.38 | 1.49 | 1.45 | 1.30 | 1.17 | 0.72 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-traile | 34 | 1.71 | 1.77 | 0.80 | 2.06 | 2.09 | 1.68 | 1.56 | 1.64 | 1.38 |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 1.31 | 1.16 | 0.87 | 1.94 | 1.50 | 1.10 | 1.16 | 1.27 | 0.82 |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 1.56 | 0.88 | 0.71 | 0.81 | 0.83 | 1.30 | 1.14 | 0.90 | 0.50 |
| Total manufacturing | | 1.35 | 1.08 | 0.65 | 1.28 | 1.14 | 1.22 | 1.15 | 1.07 | 0.68 |
| Coefficient of variation | | 0.30 | 0.27 | 0.31 | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.21 | 0.29 | 0.34 |

Table 5 Relative price levels for gross output (US = 1), manufacturing industries, 1997 (continued)

| | ISIC rev. 3 | Ireland | Italy | Luxem- bourg | Nether- lands | Norway | Poland | Portugal | Slovakia | Spain |
|--|-------------|---------|-------|-----------------|------------------|--------|--------|----------|----------|-------|
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 1.07 | 1.02 | 1.14 | 0.94 | 1.25 | 0.62 | 1.04 | 0.57 | 0.90 |
| Textiles | 17 | 1.05 | 1.06 | 1.47 | 1.17 | 1.39 | 0.70 | 0.85 | 0.62 | 0.85 |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 1.32 | 1.67 | 1.36 | 0.98 | 3.08 | 0.42 | 1.01 | 1.38 | 1.05 |
| Leather | 19 | 1.32 | 0.59 | 1.32 | 1.13 | 1.62 | 0.56 | 0.75 | 0.93 | 0.66 |
| Wood products | 20 | 1.09 | 1.02 | 1.36 | 1.99 | 1.24 | 0.56 | 0.85 | 0.72 | 0.77 |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 1.03 | 0.95 | 0.81 | 1.06 | 1.24 | 0.67 | 0.91 | 0.42 | 0.88 |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 1.45 | 0.94 | 1.25 | 1.37 | 1.34 | 0.68 | 1.02 | 0.44 | 0.83 |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and | 23 | 0.94 | 1.45 | 1.23 | 1.45 | 1.71 | 0.56 | 1.66 | 1.14 | 1.34 |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 0.67 | 0.77 | 0.83 | 0.77 | 1.15 | 0.50 | 0.83 | 0.56 | 0.71 |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 0.71 | 0.52 | 0.71 | 0.78 | 1.11 | 0.28 | 0.46 | 0.55 | 0.52 |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 0.90 | 0.57 | 0.68 | 0.88 | 1.12 | 0.36 | 0.59 | 0.38 | 0.50 |
| Basic metals | 27 | 0.87 | 0.71 | 0.86 | 0.99 | 1.41 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.80 |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 1.02 | 0.57 | 1.05 | 0.89 | 1.28 | 0.61 | 0.74 | 0.90 | 0.72 |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 1.20 | 0.72 | 1.21 | 1.35 | 1.35 | 0.77 | 1.01 | 0.91 | 0.79 |
| Office, accounting and computing mac | 30 | 0.98 | 1.10 | 1.07 | 1.03 | 1.40 | 0.80 | 0.92 | 0.30 | 0.83 |
| Other electrical machinery and appara | 31 | 1.27 | 1.01 | 1.26 | 1.32 | 1.51 | 0.76 | 0.93 | 0.77 | 0.81 |
| Radio, television and communication e | 32 | 2.37 | 1.18 | 1.27 | 1.35 | 1.80 | 1.46 | 1.10 | 0.90 | 1.25 |
| Instruments | 33 | 1.31 | 1.22 | 1.28 | 1.20 | 1.41 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 0.66 | 1.11 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-traile | 34 | 1.93 | 1.30 | 1.78 | 1.91 | 1.96 | 0.74 | 2.04 | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 1.45 | 0.78 | 1.21 | 1.03 | 1.59 | 1.28 | 1.32 | 0.71 | 1.15 |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 0.97 | 0.69 | 1.07 | 1.28 | 1.49 | 0.97 | 1.15 | 0.65 | 0.75 |
| Total manufacturing | | 1.19 | 0.95 | 1.18 | 1.14 | 1.40 | 0.67 | 1.04 | 0.71 | 0.87 |
| Coefficient of variation | | 0.33 | 0.33 | 0.23 | 0.27 | 0.28 | 0.40 | 0.35 | 0.36 | 0.25 |

Table 5 Relative price levels for gross output (US = 1), manufacturing industries, 1997 (continued)

| | ISIC rev. 3 | Sweden | U.K. | U.S. | Australia | Canada | Japan | South Korea | Taiwan | OECD unweighted average | Coefficient of variation |
|--|-------------|--------|------|------|-----------|--------|-------|-------------|--------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 1.18 | 1.23 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 2.44 | 1.48 | 1.08 | 1.01 | 0.35 |
| Textiles | 17 | 1.51 | 1.27 | 1.00 | 1.53 | 0.89 | 1.15 | 1.06 | 0.79 | 1.14 | 0.29 |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 2.40 | 1.50 | 1.00 | 1.24 | 1.11 | 1.35 | 1.43 | 0.90 | 1.70 | 0.36 |
| Leather | 19 | 1.24 | 1.23 | 1.00 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 1.71 | 0.99 | 0.75 | 1.15 | 0.28 |
| Wood products | 20 | 1.06 | 1.81 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 0.89 | 1.85 | 0.95 | 1.32 | 1.05 | 0.37 |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 0.99 | 1.24 | 1.12 | 0.76 | 0.90 | 0.22 |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 1.68 | 1.07 | 1.00 | 1.24 | 1.00 | 1.51 | 0.97 | 0.83 | 1.16 | 0.32 |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and | 23 | 1.51 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.99 | 2.28 | 1.16 | 0.93 | 1.23 | 0.29 |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 0.94 | 1.06 | 1.00 | 1.17 | 0.90 | 1.32 | 0.59 | 0.94 | 0.81 | 0.27 |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 0.99 | 0.72 | 1.00 | 1.24 | 0.98 | 1.40 | 0.75 | 0.82 | 0.73 | 0.37 |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 1.25 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.91 | 1.35 | 0.66 | 0.61 | 0.75 | 0.37 |
| Basic metals | 27 | 1.24 | 1.38 | 1.00 | 1.13 | 0.94 | 1.11 | 1.05 | 0.88 | 0.97 | 0.23 |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 0.85 | 1.08 | 1.00 | 1.26 | 0.90 | 1.45 | 0.90 | 0.84 | 1.02 | 0.28 |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 1.24 | 0.96 | 1.00 | 1.18 | 0.77 | 1.21 | 0.91 | 0.79 | 0.99 | 0.26 |
| Office, accounting and computing mac | 30 | 1.04 | 1.06 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 0.82 | 1.26 | 1.05 | 0.52 | 0.89 | 0.28 |
| Other electrical machinery and appara | 31 | 1.31 | 1.16 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.69 | 1.13 | 0.68 | 0.54 | 1.09 | 0.34 |
| Radio, television and communication e | 32 | 1.53 | 1.44 | 1.00 | 1.70 | 1.19 | 1.16 | 1.09 | 0.60 | 1.30 | 0.29 |
| Instruments | 33 | 1.23 | 1.32 | 1.00 | 1.46 | 1.18 | 1.51 | 0.86 | 0.71 | 1.21 | 0.22 |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-traile | 34 | 1.91 | 1.76 | 1.00 | 1.34 | 0.90 | 1.26 | 0.91 | 1.08 | 1.63 | 0.27 |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 1.41 | 1.21 | 1.00 | 1.47 | 0.85 | 1.15 | 0.74 | 0.56 | 1.24 | 0.25 |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 1.09 | 0.69 | 1.00 | 1.20 | 0.94 | 1.82 | 0.77 | 0.79 | 0.96 | 0.32 |
| Total manufacturing | | 1.27 | 1.20 | 1.00 | 1.12 | 0.92 | 1.50 | 1.02 | 0.80 | 1.07 | 0.21 |
| Coefficient of variation | | 0.28 | 0.25 | | 0.19 | 0.13 | 0.25 | 0.24 | 0.24 | | |

Appendix Table 1: Composition of Supply and Demand in the Netherlands and the United States, 1999.

| Industry (a) | ISIC rev. 3 code | The Netherlands, 1999 | | | | | United States, 1999 (d) | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------------|-------|
| | | as % of total use (b) | | | as % of total supply (c) | | as % of total use (b) | | | as % of total supply (c) | |
| | | Final | Inter- | Ex- | Dom- | Im- | Final | Inter- | Ex- | Dom- | Im- |
| | | expen- diture | mediate use | ports | estic | ports | expen- diture | media te use | ports | estic | ports |
| 1 Agriculture | 01-05 | 13% | 50% | 37% | 69% | 31% | 13% | 81% | 6% | 92% | 8% |
| 2 Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 1% | 80% | 19% | 46% | 54% | 1% | 96% | 3% | 71% | 29% |
| 3 Manufacturing | 15-37 | 27% | 32% | 41% | 52% | 48% | 41% | 48% | 11% | 82% | 18% |
| 4 Food, drink & tobacco | 15,16 | 34% | 26% | 40% | 76% | 24% | 62% | 33% | 5% | 94% | 6% |
| 5 Basic goods | 17,20,21,23-28 | 15% | 45% | 40% | 58% | 42% | 19% | 73% | 7% | 87% | 13% |
| 6 Non-durable | 18,19,22,36,37 | 52% | 27% | 20% | 58% | 42% | 66% | 29% | 5% | 73% | 27% |
| 7 Durable | 29-35 | 29% | 22% | 49% | 34% | 66% | 50% | 33% | 17% | 75% | 25% |
| 8 Electricity, gas and water sup | 40,41 | 34% | 66% | 0% | 98% | 2% | 48% | 52% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| 9 Construction | 45 | 58% | 40% | 2% | 100% | 0% | 79% | 21% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| 10 Trade | 50-52 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 66% | 30% | 4% | 101% | -1% |
| 11 Hotels & catering | 55 | 72% | 28% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 81% | 19% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| 12 Transport | 60-63 | 21% | 29% | 50% | 91% | 9% | 37% | 53% | 10% | 92% | 8% |
| 13 Communications | 64 | 33% | 59% | 9% | 91% | 9% | 49% | 50% | 1% | 100% | 0% |
| 14 Finance | 65-67 | 64% | 33% | 3% | 97% | 3% | 53% | 44% | 3% | 100% | 0% |
| 15 Real estate activities | 70 | 73% | 27% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 63% | 35% | 2% | 100% | 0% |
| 16 Business services | 71-74 | 17% | 68% | 15% | 86% | 14% | 26% | 73% | 2% | 100% | 0% |
| 17 Public administration and def | 75 | 95% | 5% | 0% | 100% | 0% | not available | | | 100% | 0% |
| 18 Education and health | 80,85 | 94% | 6% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 96% | 4% | 0% | 100% | 0% |
| 19 Other community, social and | 90-95 | 28% | 52% | 19% | 83% | 17% | 61% | 33% | 5% | 100% | 0% |

Notes: (a) based on use and make tables which list supply and demand of products rather than industries.

Products have been used as proxies for industries by allocating them to their primary sector of production.

(b) by definition total use is sum of intermediate use, exports and final expenditure

(c) by definition total supply is sum of domestic production and imports

(d) Due to differences in ISIC rev 3 and the classification used in the U.S. Input-output tables, the results for industries 20, 22, 24, 34 and 50 are proxies.

Sources: Statistics Netherlands, *Supply and use tables*, 1999 and Bureau of Economic Analysis, *Input-Output Accounts* for 1999.

Appendix Table 2 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (broad sectors)

| Broad sectors | Australia | | | Austria | | | Belgium | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|------|
| | Number of production | Number of expen | Coverage of | Number of production | Number of expen | Coverage of | Number of production | Number of expen | Coverage of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 67 | 0 | 75% | 49 | 0 | 70% | 29 | 0 | 87% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 36 | 0 | 73% | 11 | 0 | 54% | 6 | 0 | 37% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 216 | 58 | 39% | 465 | 56 | 30% | 351 | 63 | 22% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 98% | 0 | 11 | 100% | 0 | 11 | 77% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 64 | 0 | 100% | 67 | 0 | 100% | 18 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 18 | 0 | 63% | 23 | 0 | 76% | 20 | 0 | 66% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 82% | 0 | 15 | 81% | 0 | 15 | 87% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 82% | 0 | 9 | 52% | 0 | 9 | 65% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 89% | 0 | 39 | 78% | 0 | 39 | 88% |

| Broad sectors | Canada | | | Czech Republic | | | Denmark | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------|------|
| | Number of production | Number of expen | Coverage of | Number of production | Number of expen | Coverage of | Number of production | Number of expen | Coverage of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 56 | 0 | 53% | 52 | 0 | 69% | 37 | 0 | 69% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 22 | 0 | 81% | 8 | 0 | 66% | 10 | 0 | 80% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 277 | 59 | 41% | 409 | 63 | 38% | 600 | 43 | 34% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% | 1 | 4 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 100% | 0 | 11 | 50% | 0 | 11 | 86% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 60 | 0 | 100% | 18 | 0 | 100% | 36 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 21 | 0 | 57% | 20 | 0 | 64% | 18 | 0 | 43% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 84% | 0 | 15 | 89% | 0 | 15 | 97% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 46% | 0 | 9 | 73% | 0 | 9 | 56% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 77% | 0 | 39 | 86% | 0 | 39 | 85% |

Appendix Table 2 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (broad sectors) (continued)

| | Finland | | | France | | | Germany | | | |
|--|----------------|-----------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|----------------|-----------|----------|------|
| | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | |
| | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 28 | 0 | 38% | 70 | 0 | 67% | 48 | 0 | 70% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 16 | 0 | 60% | 15 | 0 | 51% | 38 | 0 | 100% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 349 | 52 | 23% | 696 | 48 | 36% | 1936 | 26 | 26% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 100% | 0 | 11 | 90% | 0 | 11 | 100% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 62 | 0 | 100% | 66 | 0 | 100% | 62 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 22 | 0 | 87% | 25 | 0 | 82% | 26 | 0 | 82% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 97% | 0 | 15 | 85% | 0 | 15 | 84% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 59% | 0 | 9 | 78% | 0 | 9 | 66% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 85% | 0 | 39 | 91% | 0 | 39 | 85% |

| | Greece | | | Hungary | | | Ireland | | | |
|--|---------------|-----------|----------|----------------|-----------|----------|----------------|-----------|----------|------|
| | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | |
| | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 67 | 0 | 100% | 58 | 0 | 72% | 33 | 0 | 69% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 1 | 0 | 0% | 11 | 0 | 21% | 7 | 0 | 33% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 506 | 49 | 29% | 461 | 49 | 36% | 248 | 64 | 19% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 100% | 0 | 11 | 100% | 0 | 11 | 84% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 67 | 0 | 100% | 64 | 0 | 100% | 64 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 18 | 0 | 57% | 21 | 0 | 78% | 17 | 0 | 62% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 71% | 0 | 15 | 85% | 0 | 15 | 96% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 79% | 0 | 9 | 28% | 0 | 9 | 87% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 92% | 0 | 39 | 64% | 0 | 39 | 96% |

Appendix Table 2 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (broad sectors) (continued)

| | Italy | | | Japan | | | Luxembourg | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------|----------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|------|
| | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | |
| | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 70 | 0 | 89% | 55 | 0 | 75% | 9 | 0 | 74% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 18 | 0 | 30% | 19 | 0 | 12% | 0 | 0 | 0% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 1075 | 35 | 38% | 214 | 58 | 27% | 6 | 93 | 10% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 32% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 81% | 0 | 11 | 82% | 0 | 11 | 100% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 64 | 0 | 100% | 38 | 0 | 100% | 67 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 22 | 0 | 66% | 23 | 0 | 94% | 16 | 0 | 49% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 82% | 0 | 15 | 83% | 0 | 15 | 95% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 74% | 0 | 9 | 93% | 0 | 9 | 58% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 89% | 0 | 39 | 94% | 0 | 39 | 76% |

| | Netherlands | | | Norway | | | Poland | | | |
|--|--------------------|-----------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|------|
| | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | |
| | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 44 | 0 | 60% | 30 | 0 | 34% | 41 | 0 | 74% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 5 | 0 | 83% | 10 | 0 | 100% | 10 | 0 | 57% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 309 | 54 | 24% | 143 | 77 | 28% | 191 | 64 | 35% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 1 | 4 | 81% | 2 | 4 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 80% | 0 | 11 | 100% | 0 | 11 | 100% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 63 | 0 | 100% | 67 | 0 | 100% | 67 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 22 | 0 | 72% | 23 | 0 | 76% | 21 | 0 | 69% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 88% | 0 | 15 | 88% | 0 | 15 | 88% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 68% | 0 | 9 | 54% | 0 | 9 | 65% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 87% | 0 | 39 | 84% | 0 | 39 | 82% |

Appendix Table 2 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (broad sectors) (continued)

| | Portugal | | | Slovakia | | | South Korea | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|-------------|-----------|----------|------|
| | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | |
| | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 60 | 0 | 67% | 56 | 0 | 66% | 48 | 0 | 70% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 7 | 0 | 31% | 4 | 0 | 63% | 8 | 0 | 50% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 650 | 48 | 36% | 0 | 127 | 17% | 205 | 57 | 28% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 1 | 4 | 67% | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 64% | 0 | 11 | 66% | 0 | 11 | 79% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 18 | 0 | 100% | 56 | 0 | 100% | 30 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 20 | 0 | 65% | 21 | 0 | 59% | 24 | 0 | 67% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 85% | 0 | 15 | 80% | 0 | 15 | 86% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 81% | 0 | 9 | 81% | 0 | 9 | 93% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 92% | 0 | 39 | 91% | 0 | 39 | 95% |

(a) For Taiwan, no ICP PPPs are available. UVRs for 45, 55, 65-74, 90-95 and 75-85 stem from the ICPA project

| | Spain | | | Sweden | | | Taiwan (a) | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|------------|-----------|----------|------|
| | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | Number of | Number of | Coverage | |
| | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | production | of expen | of | |
| | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | PPPs | PPPs | output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 76 | 0 | 80% | 37 | 0 | 43% | 26 | 0 | 43% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 10 | 0 | 50% | 18 | 0 | 26% | 9 | 0 | 15% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 1203 | 35 | 37% | 255 | 53 | 25% | 112 | 0 | 20% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 1 | 4 | 81% | 3 | 0 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 90% | 0 | 11 | 92% | 5 | 0 | 66% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 67 | 0 | 100% | 64 | 0 | 100% | 31 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% | 1 | 0 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 24 | 0 | 66% | 23 | 0 | 73% | 18 | 0 | 61% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 80% | 0 | 15 | 98% | 5 | 0 | 99% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 87% | 0 | 9 | 53% | 2 | 0 | 100% |
| Public administration, education and t | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 95% | 0 | 39 | 84% | 2 | 0 | 100% |

Appendix Table 2 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (broad sectors) (continued)

| | U.K. | | | U.S.A. | | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | |
| Agriculture, forestry and fishing | 01-05 | 42 | 0 | 57% | 94 | 0 | 63% |
| Mining and quarrying | 10-14 | 14 | 0 | 16% | 22 | 0 | 57% |
| Manufacturing | 15-37 | 832 | 34 | 29% | 510 | 47 | 34% |
| Electricity, gas and water supply | 40-41 | 2 | 4 | 100% | 2 | 4 | 100% |
| Construction | 45 | 0 | 11 | 72% | 0 | 11 | 14% |
| Trade | 50-52 | 60 | 0 | 100% | 67 | 0 | 100% |
| Hotels and restaurants | 55 | 0 | 4 | 100% | 0 | 4 | 100% |
| Transport and communication | 60-64 | 26 | 0 | 57% | 27 | 0 | 65% |
| Financial and business services | 65-74 | 0 | 15 | 88% | 0 | 15 | 85% |
| Other community, social and persona | 90-95 | 0 | 9 | 77% | 0 | 9 | 72% |
| Public administration, education and h | 75-85 | 0 | 39 | 91% | 0 | 39 | 91% |

Appendix Table 3 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (manufacturing industries)

| | Australia | | | | Austria | | | | Belgium | | | | Canada | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: coverage by exp PPP | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 62 | 0 | 61% | 0% | 107 | 5 | 50% | 2% | 103 | 7 | 43% | 5% | 100 | 3 | 45% | 3% |
| Textiles | 17 | 12 | 1 | 42% | 6% | 19 | 2 | 15% | 2% | 27 | 1 | 21% | 1% | 7 | 2 | 27% | 15% |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 41 | 0 | 60% | 0% | 81 | 0 | 66% | 0% | 36 | 0 | 10% | 0% | 38 | 0 | 47% | 0% |
| Leather | 19 | 6 | 0 | 72% | 0% | 6 | 0 | 64% | 0% | 0 | 3 | 9% | 9% | 12 | 0 | 41% | 0% |
| Wood products | 20 | 10 | 0 | 36% | 0% | 29 | 0 | 61% | 0% | 20 | 0 | 51% | 0% | 16 | 0 | 79% | 0% |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 5 | 0 | 33% | 0% | 7 | 0 | 23% | 0% | 6 | 0 | 18% | 0% | 13 | 0 | 68% | 0% |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 0 | 5 | 9% | 9% | 10 | 3 | 28% | 0% | 10 | 3 | 28% | 0% | 0 | 5 | 10% | 10% |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel | 23 | 5 | 1 | 81% | 1% | 0 | 3 | 43% | 43% | 0 | 3 | 16% | 16% | 9 | 1 | 82% | 2% |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 32 | 2 | 26% | 1% | 24 | 2 | 13% | 2% | 43 | 2 | 12% | 1% | 29 | 2 | 23% | 9% |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 0 | 2 | 15% | 15% | 21 | 0 | 30% | 0% | 13 | 0 | 13% | 0% | 3 | 1 | 29% | 8% |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 5 | 1 | 14% | 0% | 26 | 0 | 40% | 0% | 19 | 0 | 34% | 0% | 9 | 1 | 39% | 1% |
| Basic metals | 27 | 13 | 0 | 49% | 0% | 14 | 0 | 8% | 0% | 12 | 0 | 6% | 0% | 18 | 0 | 35% | 0% |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 4 | 4 | 9% | 4% | 45 | 0 | 39% | 0% | 28 | 0 | 26% | 0% | 3 | 4 | 8% | 7% |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 14 | 8 | 34% | 17% | 22 | 9 | 12% | 1% | 10 | 10 | 10% | 5% | 16 | 9 | 16% | 10% |
| Office, accounting and computing machinery | 30 | 0 | 2 | 26% | 26% | 0 | 2 | 27% | 27% | 0 | 2 | 43% | 43% | 0 | 2 | 37% | 37% |
| Other electrical machinery and apparatus nec | 31 | 4 | 3 | 6% | 2% | 16 | 2 | 25% | 1% | 3 | 3 | 6% | 5% | 1 | 3 | 12% | 11% |
| Radio, television and communication equipment | 32 | 3 | 2 | 14% | 10% | 1 | 4 | 12% | 5% | 1 | 4 | 19% | 17% | 0 | 4 | 15% | 15% |
| Instruments | 33 | 0 | 7 | 23% | 23% | 0 | 7 | 6% | 6% | 0 | 7 | 26% | 26% | 0 | 7 | 50% | 50% |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | 34 | 0 | 6 | 40% | 40% | 2 | 6 | 24% | 16% | 0 | 6 | 13% | 13% | 3 | 1 | 47% | 2% |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 0 | 7 | 21% | 21% | 0 | 7 | 19% | 19% | 0 | 7 | 33% | 33% | 0 | 7 | 43% | 43% |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 0 | 7 | 73% | 73% | 35 | 4 | 44% | 9% | 20 | 5 | 59% | 10% | 0 | 7 | 71% | 71% |
| Total Manufacturing | 15-37 | 216 | 58 | 39% | 9% | 465 | 56 | 30% | 4% | 351 | 63 | 22% | 5% | 277 | 59 | 41% | 9% |

| | Czech Republic | | | | Denmark | | | | Finland | | | | France | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: coverage by exp PPP | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 74 | 0 | 61% | 0% | 168 | 0 | 70% | 0% | 108 | 2 | 53% | 1% | 183 | 2 | 65% | 1% |
| Textiles | 17 | 38 | 0 | 59% | 0% | 14 | 2 | 21% | 5% | 13 | 2 | 39% | 6% | 33 | 2 | 17% | 9% |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 0 | 4 | 40% | 40% | 89 | 0 | 66% | 0% | 68 | 0 | 40% | 0% | 17 | 0 | 9% | 0% |
| Leather | 19 | 2 | 3 | 38% | 27% | 9 | 0 | 86% | 0% | 4 | 0 | 39% | 0% | 19 | 0 | 48% | 0% |
| Wood products | 20 | 15 | 0 | 23% | 0% | 10 | 0 | 10% | 0% | 13 | 0 | 42% | 0% | 36 | 0 | 51% | 0% |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 26 | 0 | 61% | 0% | 21 | 0 | 15% | 0% | 20 | 0 | 36% | 0% | 34 | 0 | 33% | 0% |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 7 | 3 | 19% | 1% | 0 | 5 | 10% | 10% | 13 | 3 | 24% | 0% | 11 | 3 | 39% | 0% |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel | 23 | 6 | 3 | 31% | 31% | 0 | 2 | 24% | 24% | 0 | 3 | 19% | 19% | 0 | 3 | 41% | 41% |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 76 | 2 | 43% | 2% | 68 | 2 | 25% | 6% | 29 | 2 | 12% | 1% | 101 | 2 | 32% | 13% |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 27 | 0 | 36% | 0% | 11 | 1 | 7% | 4% | 0 | 2 | 4% | 4% | 42 | 0 | 48% | 0% |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 27 | 1 | 27% | 1% | 25 | 0 | 30% | 0% | 10 | 1 | 7% | 0% | 55 | 0 | 42% | 0% |
| Basic metals | 27 | 47 | 0 | 73% | 0% | 14 | 0 | 8% | 0% | 7 | 0 | 3% | 0% | 42 | 0 | 23% | 0% |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 7 | 4 | 13% | 10% | 10 | 2 | 4% | 3% | 5 | 3 | 7% | 5% | 38 | 1 | 8% | 1% |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 13 | 14 | 20% | 12% | 77 | 0 | 12% | 0% | 22 | 2 | 10% | 1% | 58 | 7 | 14% | 7% |
| Office, accounting and computing machinery | 30 | 0 | 2 | 28% | 28% | 3 | 2 | 19% | 19% | 0 | 2 | 10% | 10% | 0 | 2 | 17% | 17% |
| Other electrical machinery and apparatus nec | 31 | 27 | 3 | 20% | 6% | 15 | 3 | 35% | 3% | 11 | 3 | 16% | 2% | 1 | 3 | 7% | 7% |
| Radio, television and communication equipment | 32 | 3 | 4 | 28% | 23% | 12 | 0 | 25% | 0% | 1 | 4 | 6% | 5% | 1 | 4 | 17% | 17% |
| Instruments | 33 | 0 | 7 | 23% | 23% | 19 | 7 | 14% | 14% | 3 | 7 | 16% | 16% | 11 | 7 | 19% | 19% |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | 34 | 10 | 0 | 15% | 0% | 0 | 6 | 25% | 25% | 3 | 5 | 40% | 7% | 3 | 1 | 63% | 32% |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 0 | 7 | 31% | 31% | 3 | 7 | 35% | 35% | 0 | 7 | 8% | 8% | 0 | 7 | 14% | 14% |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 4 | 6 | 46% | 45% | 32 | 4 | 59% | 5% | 19 | 4 | 39% | 7% | 11 | 4 | 17% | 12% |
| Total Manufacturing | 15-37 | 409 | 63 | 38% | 7% | 600 | 43 | 34% | 4% | 349 | 52 | 23% | 3% | 696 | 48 | 36% | 10% |

Appendix Table 3 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (manufacturing industries) (continued)

| | Germany | | | | Greece | | | | Hungary | | | | Ireland | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: coverage by exp PPP | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 232 | 0 | 53% | 7% | 113 | 5 | 36% | 2% | 58 | 5 | 56% | 3% | 77 | 2 | 66% | 4% |
| Textiles | 17 | 131 | 0 | 27% | 7% | 43 | 0 | 27% | 0% | 57 | 0 | 32% | 0% | 10 | 2 | 21% | 7% |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 113 | 0 | 26% | 5% | 101 | 0 | 22% | 0% | 48 | 0 | 19% | 0% | 37 | 0 | 36% | 0% |
| Leather | 19 | 21 | 0 | 29% | 13% | 12 | 0 | 19% | 0% | 10 | 0 | 14% | 0% | 0 | 3 | 5% | 5% |
| Wood products | 20 | 48 | 0 | 26% | 0% | 23 | 0 | 11% | 0% | 13 | 0 | 29% | 0% | 10 | 0 | 25% | 0% |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 66 | 0 | 27% | 1% | 12 | 0 | 39% | 0% | 26 | 0 | 81% | 0% | 0 | 2 | 15% | 15% |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 20 | 3 | 28% | 3% | 10 | 3 | 7% | 4% | 5 | 3 | 11% | 1% | 10 | 3 | 19% | 12% |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel | 23 | 0 | 3 | 26% | 27% | 0 | 3 | 17% | 17% | 9 | 3 | 31% | 31% | 0 | 0 | | |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 164 | 2 | 15% | 3% | 40 | 2 | 34% | 10% | 61 | 2 | 34% | 5% | 14 | 2 | 1% | 1% |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 71 | 0 | 22% | 3% | 13 | 1 | 17% | 1% | 27 | 0 | 44% | 0% | 10 | 1 | 17% | 0% |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 98 | 0 | 29% | 1% | 16 | 1 | 47% | 1% | 24 | 1 | 45% | 2% | 10 | 2 | 43% | 1% |
| Basic metals | 27 | 93 | 0 | 21% | 0% | 12 | 0 | 24% | 0% | 15 | 0 | 54% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 146 | 0 | 17% | 4% | 28 | 1 | 15% | 1% | 22 | 1 | 12% | 2% | 21 | 0 | 31% | 0% |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 354 | 0 | 15% | 6% | 36 | 2 | 24% | 4% | 27 | 2 | 24% | 2% | 16 | 14 | 15% | 7% |
| Office, accounting and computing machinery | 30 | 11 | 2 | 28% | 28% | 0 | 2 | 24% | 24% | 0 | 2 | 28% | 28% | 3 | 2 | 6% | 6% |
| Other electrical machinery and apparatus nec | 31 | 90 | 0 | 15% | 4% | 19 | 2 | 47% | 1% | 23 | 2 | 41% | 3% | 10 | 3 | 12% | 1% |
| Radio, television and communication equipment | 32 | 31 | 0 | 23% | 18% | 0 | 4 | 63% | 63% | 3 | 4 | 27% | 26% | 1 | 4 | 1% | 1% |
| Instruments | 33 | 104 | 7 | 26% | 25% | 0 | 7 | 27% | 27% | 7 | 7 | 23% | 23% | 0 | 6 | 3% | 3% |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | 34 | 27 | 0 | 29% | 19% | 4 | 5 | 53% | 46% | 0 | 6 | 21% | 21% | 1 | 6 | 22% | 21% |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 21 | 7 | 30% | 30% | 0 | 7 | 15% | 15% | 0 | 7 | 31% | 31% | 0 | 7 | 57% | 57% |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 95 | 2 | 54% | 17% | 24 | 4 | 38% | 12% | 26 | 4 | 42% | 8% | 18 | 5 | 33% | 12% |
| Total Manufacturing | 15-37 | 1936 | 26 | 26% | 9% | 506 | 49 | 29% | 5% | 461 | 49 | 36% | 9% | 248 | 64 | 19% | 5% |

| | Italy | | | | Japan | | | | Luxembourg | | | | Netherlands | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: coverage by exp PPP | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 190 | 0 | 64% | 0% | 21 | 16 | 33% | 16% | 6 | 36 | 49% | 31% | 125 | 0 | 53% | 0% |
| Textiles | 17 | 0 | 3 | 11% | 11% | 13 | 2 | 38% | 10% | 0 | 3 | 32% | 32% | 15 | 1 | 35% | 1% |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 0 | 4 | 38% | 38% | 19 | 0 | 26% | 0% | 0 | 0 | | | 32 | 0 | 24% | 0% |
| Leather | 19 | 17 | 0 | 34% | 0% | 11 | 0 | 48% | 0% | 0 | 0 | | | 1 | 3 | 17% | 13% |
| Wood products | 20 | 38 | 0 | 50% | 0% | 3 | 0 | 48% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 5 | 0 | 19% | 0% |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 41 | 0 | 37% | 0% | 9 | 0 | 26% | 0% | 0 | 0 | | | 8 | 0 | 20% | 0% |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 17 | 3 | 23% | 0% | 0 | 5 | 5% | 5% | 0 | 5 | 5% | 5% | 5 | 3 | 32% | 1% |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel | 23 | 0 | 3 | 34% | 34% | 8 | 1 | 59% | 2% | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 3 | 8% | 8% |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 101 | 2 | 26% | 9% | 36 | 0 | 14% | 0% | 0 | 4 | 1% | 1% | 41 | 2 | 11% | 1% |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 52 | 0 | 32% | 0% | 5 | 1 | 12% | 4% | 0 | 2 | 1% | 1% | 4 | 1 | 2% | 0% |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 63 | 0 | 43% | 0% | 8 | 1 | 25% | 1% | 0 | 2 | 1% | 1% | 12 | 1 | 40% | 0% |
| Basic metals | 27 | 67 | 0 | 33% | 0% | 40 | 0 | 38% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% | 5 | 0 | 9% | 0% |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 90 | 0 | 34% | 0% | 4 | 4 | 7% | 4% | 0 | 4 | 8% | 8% | 4 | 4 | 10% | 7% |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 210 | 0 | 35% | 0% | 29 | 0 | 14% | 0% | 0 | 15 | 10% | 10% | 19 | 3 | 9% | 3% |
| Office, accounting and computing machinery | 30 | 0 | 2 | 21% | 21% | 0 | 2 | 54% | 54% | 0 | 2 | 48% | 48% | 0 | 2 | 5% | 5% |
| Other electrical machinery and apparatus nec | 31 | 43 | 1 | 17% | 1% | 0 | 3 | 12% | 12% | 0 | 3 | 5% | 5% | 12 | 3 | 19% | 1% |
| Radio, television and communication equipment | 32 | 17 | 0 | 12% | 0% | 4 | 2 | 33% | 5% | 0 | 2 | 56% | 56% | 0 | 4 | 3% | 3% |
| Instruments | 33 | 37 | 7 | 47% | 47% | 0 | 7 | 45% | 45% | 0 | 1 | 56% | 56% | 0 | 7 | 18% | 18% |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | 34 | 19 | 0 | 64% | 25% | 4 | 1 | 29% | 15% | 0 | 0 | | | 4 | 5 | 18% | 9% |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 8 | 7 | 31% | 31% | 0 | 7 | 20% | 20% | 0 | 7 | 67% | 67% | 0 | 7 | 25% | 25% |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 65 | 3 | 55% | 11% | 0 | 6 | 29% | 29% | 0 | 7 | 4% | 4% | 17 | 5 | 30% | 12% |
| Total Manufacturing | 15-37 | 1075 | 35 | 38% | 7% | 214 | 58 | 27% | 9% | 6 | 93 | 10% | 9% | 309 | 54 | 24% | 3% |

Appendix Table 3 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (manufacturing industries) (continued)

| | Norway | | | | Poland | | | | Portugal | | | | Slovakia | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|------------|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: coverage by exp PPP | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 80 | 5 | 51% | 2% | 52 | 2 | 55% | 2% | 115 | 10 | 49% | 8% | 0 | 44 | 52% | 52% |
| Textiles | 17 | 3 | 3 | 12% | 6% | 22 | 0 | 38% | 0% | 52 | 0 | 20% | 0% | 0 | 3 | 11% | 11% |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 12 | 0 | 35% | 0% | 10 | 0 | 37% | 0% | 110 | 0 | 34% | 0% | 0 | 4 | 41% | 41% |
| Leather | 19 | 0 | 3 | 12% | 12% | 2 | 3 | 43% | 33% | 15 | 0 | 48% | 0% | 0 | 3 | 34% | 34% |
| Wood products | 20 | 9 | 0 | 39% | 0% | 9 | 0 | 22% | 0% | 29 | 0 | 22% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 0 | 2 | 1% | 1% | 1 | 2 | 23% | 23% | 16 | 0 | 20% | 0% | 0 | 2 | 7% | 7% |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 7 | 3 | 26% | 0% | 0 | 5 | 14% | 14% | 18 | 3 | 24% | 0% | 0 | 5 | 6% | 6% |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel | 23 | 0 | 2 | 13% | 13% | 3 | 3 | 31% | 31% | 0 | 2 | 39% | 39% | 0 | 3 | 0% | 31% |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 9 | 3 | 5% | 2% | 19 | 3 | 23% | 4% | 46 | 2 | 23% | 7% | 0 | 4 | 4% | 4% |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 0 | 2 | 6% | 6% | 8 | 0 | 41% | 0% | 30 | 0 | 20% | 0% | 0 | 2 | 9% | 9% |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 5 | 2 | 21% | 1% | 21 | 0 | 24% | 0% | 38 | 0 | 52% | 0% | 0 | 2 | 5% | 5% |
| Basic metals | 27 | 5 | 0 | 37% | 0% | 21 | 0 | 52% | 0% | 12 | 0 | 20% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 2 | 4 | 4% | 3% | 10 | 1 | 18% | 1% | 56 | 0 | 36% | 0% | 0 | 4 | 7% | 7% |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 1 | 15 | 7% | 7% | 5 | 15 | 19% | 15% | 50 | 0 | 19% | 0% | 0 | 15 | 16% | 16% |
| Office, accounting and computing machinery | 30 | 0 | 2 | 0% | 0% | 0 | 2 | 28% | 28% | 0 | 2 | 59% | 59% | 0 | 2 | 28% | 28% |
| Other electrical machinery and apparatus nec | 31 | 0 | 3 | 3% | 3% | 5 | 3 | 16% | 5% | 12 | 2 | 32% | 15% | 0 | 3 | 5% | 5% |
| Radio, television and communication equipment | 32 | 0 | 4 | 14% | 14% | 0 | 4 | 23% | 23% | 0 | 4 | 20% | 20% | 0 | 4 | 16% | 16% |
| Instruments | 33 | 0 | 6 | 37% | 38% | 0 | 7 | 27% | 27% | 6 | 7 | 25% | 25% | 0 | 7 | 26% | 26% |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | 34 | 0 | 6 | 6% | 6% | 3 | 1 | 13% | 1% | 7 | 5 | 46% | 43% | 0 | 6 | 27% | 27% |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 0 | 7 | 39% | 39% | 0 | 7 | 31% | 31% | 0 | 7 | 50% | 50% | 0 | 7 | 31% | 31% |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 10 | 5 | 39% | 8% | 0 | 6 | 62% | 62% | 38 | 4 | 55% | 16% | 0 | 7 | 62% | 62% |
| Total Manufacturing | 15-37 | 143 | 77 | 28% | 8% | 191 | 64 | 35% | 9% | 650 | 48 | 36% | 9% | 0 | 127 | 17% | 19% |

| | South Korea | | | | Spain | | | | Sweden | | | | Taiwan | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: coverage by exp PPP | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 53 | 8 | 45% | 1% | 182 | 5 | 50% | 4% | 84 | 2 | 63% | 2% | 21 | 0 | 35% | 0% |
| Textiles | 17 | 9 | 2 | 12% | 1% | 102 | 0 | 31% | 0% | 6 | 2 | 23% | 3% | 7 | 0 | 36% | 0% |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 11 | 0 | 21% | 0% | 113 | 0 | 52% | 0% | 10 | 0 | 15% | 0% | 11 | 0 | 69% | 0% |
| Leather | 19 | 12 | 0 | 58% | 0% | 14 | 0 | 26% | 0% | 0 | 3 | 2% | 2% | 2 | 0 | 24% | 0% |
| Wood products | 20 | 3 | 0 | 33% | 0% | 43 | 0 | 39% | 0% | 16 | 0 | 68% | 0% | 3 | 0 | 74% | 0% |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 3 | 2 | 39% | 3% | 34 | 0 | 31% | 0% | 19 | 0 | 43% | 0% | 7 | 0 | 20% | 0% |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 0 | 5 | 14% | 14% | 20 | 3 | 31% | 0% | 9 | 3 | 38% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel | 23 | 8 | 1 | 49% | 0% | 0 | 3 | 34% | 34% | 0 | 3 | 22% | 22% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 26 | 3 | 17% | 2% | 98 | 2 | 35% | 16% | 25 | 2 | 13% | 4% | 8 | 0 | 9% | 0% |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 0 | 2 | 5% | 5% | 51 | 0 | 28% | 0% | 10 | 0 | 10% | 0% | 2 | 0 | 2% | 0% |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 5 | 1 | 15% | 1% | 59 | 0 | 59% | 0% | 7 | 2 | 16% | 1% | 2 | 0 | 21% | 0% |
| Basic metals | 27 | 33 | 0 | 36% | 0% | 35 | 0 | 22% | 0% | 10 | 0 | 8% | 0% | 21 | 0 | 52% | 0% |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 3 | 4 | 10% | 8% | 109 | 0 | 29% | 0% | 13 | 1 | 9% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 16 | 3 | 22% | 4% | 166 | 0 | 26% | 0% | 17 | 3 | 13% | 2% | 5 | 0 | 6% | 0% |
| Office, accounting and computing machinery | 30 | 4 | 2 | 3% | 3% | 0 | 2 | 53% | 53% | 0 | 2 | 20% | 20% | 3 | 0 | 20% | 0% |
| Other electrical machinery and apparatus nec | 31 | 1 | 2 | 2% | 1% | 65 | 1 | 43% | 1% | 8 | 3 | 19% | 2% | 3 | 0 | 2% | 0% |
| Radio, television and communication equipment | 32 | 3 | 2 | 16% | 1% | 14 | 2 | 23% | 16% | 2 | 4 | 10% | 8% | 8 | 0 | 24% | 0% |
| Instruments | 33 | 0 | 7 | 26% | 26% | 22 | 7 | 49% | 49% | 0 | 7 | 14% | 14% | 1 | 0 | 5% | 0% |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | 34 | 6 | 1 | 51% | 1% | 18 | 0 | 29% | 0% | 7 | 5 | 17% | 13% | 4 | 0 | 46% | 0% |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 0 | 7 | 36% | 36% | 0 | 7 | 25% | 25% | 0 | 7 | 13% | 13% | 2 | 0 | 22% | 0% |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 9 | 5 | 32% | 22% | 58 | 3 | 48% | 6% | 12 | 4 | 38% | 6% | 2 | 0 | 1% | 0% |
| Total Manufacturing | 15-37 | 205 | 57 | 28% | 4% | 1203 | 35 | 37% | 5% | 255 | 53 | 25% | 5% | 112 | 0 | 20% | 0% |

Appendix Table 3 Summary statistics of price data used for derivation of output PPPs (manufacturing industries) (continued)

| | UK | | | | | US | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------------|--|
| | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: coverage by exp PPP | | Number of production PPPs | Number of expen PPPs | Coverage of output | of which: ICP coverage | |
| Food, beverages and tobacco | 15-16 | 112 | 2 | 54% | 1% | 133 | 0 | 61% | 0% | |
| Textiles | 17 | 73 | 0 | 40% | 0% | 25 | 1 | 46% | 3% | |
| Wearing apparel | 18 | 89 | 0 | 55% | 0% | 38 | 0 | 84% | 0% | |
| Leather | 19 | 12 | 0 | 45% | 0% | 12 | 0 | 67% | 0% | |
| Wood products | 20 | 15 | 0 | 17% | 0% | 13 | 0 | 24% | 0% | |
| Pulp, paper and paper products | 21 | 5 | 0 | 5% | 0% | 18 | 0 | 45% | 0% | |
| Printing and publishing | 22 | 10 | 3 | 36% | 1% | 0 | 5 | 2% | 2% | |
| Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel | 23 | 0 | 3 | 38% | 38% | 10 | 2 | 40% | 40% | |
| Chemicals and allied products | 24 | 101 | 2 | 20% | 1% | 58 | 2 | 28% | 12% | |
| Rubber and plastics products | 25 | 24 | 0 | 11% | 0% | 0 | 2 | 2% | 2% | |
| Non-metallic mineral products | 26 | 44 | 1 | 19% | 1% | 20 | 0 | 22% | 0% | |
| Basic metals | 27 | 15 | 0 | 6% | 0% | 42 | 0 | 48% | 0% | |
| Fabricated metal products | 28 | 21 | 2 | 9% | 7% | 10 | 4 | 6% | 2% | |
| Machinery, nec | 29 | 138 | 0 | 18% | 0% | 52 | 0 | 12% | 0% | |
| Office, accounting and computing machinery | 30 | 3 | 2 | 9% | 9% | 6 | 2 | 36% | 36% | |
| Other electrical machinery and apparatus nec | 31 | 39 | 1 | 27% | 1% | 18 | 2 | 34% | 3% | |
| Radio, television and communication equipment | 32 | 12 | 2 | 13% | 7% | 15 | 2 | 19% | 8% | |
| Instruments | 33 | 45 | 7 | 17% | 17% | 16 | 7 | 42% | 42% | |
| Motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers | 34 | 13 | 0 | 57% | 26% | 4 | 6 | 54% | 27% | |
| Other transport equipment | 35 | 5 | 7 | 14% | 14% | 0 | 7 | 39% | 39% | |
| Manufacturing nec, recycling | 36-37 | 56 | 2 | 49% | 5% | 20 | 5 | 38% | 16% | |
| Total Manufacturing | 15-37 | 832 | 34 | 29% | 6% | 510 | 47 | 34% | 11% | |