



OECD SHORT-TERM ECONOMIC STATISTICS EXPERT GROUP (STESSEG)

Development of comparable quarterly unit labour cost indexes for OECD countries

Paper prepared by Richard McKenzie
Statistics Directorate, OECD

Submitted to the Expert Group under item 6 of the draft agenda

Meeting:
27 – 28 June 2005

Room 3
OECD Headquarters, Paris
Starting at 9:30 a.m. on the first day

Development of comparable quarterly unit labour cost indexes for OECD countries

1. Introduction

1 This paper presents a strategy for estimating quarterly unit labour cost (ULC) indexes, benchmarked to more reliable annual ULC indexes, for a broad selection of industries using a consistent methodology across all OECD countries. A comprehensive review of available data sources to support this analysis has already been performed and presentation of results from this study forms a major part of this paper.

2 The ultimate goal of this project will be to develop an ongoing production system for producing quarterly ULC indexes that satisfy the data requirements of OECD users. These comprise mainly the OECD Economics Department, who is a key internal user, though the project also aims to provide a comprehensive dataset to support a variety of external user needs including national institutions of OECD Member countries. These data would ideally be published online in conjunction with the OECD productivity database and in the OECD's *Main Economic Indicators* (MEI) publication.

3 This paper is structured as follows: first a brief review of existing sources for ULC indexes is given, followed by an analysis of key methodological issues, the industries which could be covered and possible sources for the required annual benchmark ULC indexes. An assessment of priorities for quarterly indicator variables is then described together with a detailed description of the availability of desired quarterly indicator variables across OECD countries. Some strategies for evaluating the suitability of quarterly indicator variables will be proposed and finally a brief description of the feedback now being sought from national statistical organisations (NSOs) and prospective users are outlined, together with work required for the next phases of this project.

4 The OECD is very interested in the views of STESEG participants, in particular those representing national statistical organisations. The key issues for which feedback is sought from STESEG representatives or relevant experts on this subject within your organisations are:

- details from those NSOs (or other institutions) currently producing quarterly ULC indexes, outlining the methodology used and the industries covered;
- reactions from NSOs to the data availability matrix in Attachment 1. For example, are these the best sources of data available for your country? In particular, does appropriate data exist for the components that we have listed as having no available data?
- opinions on the possible choices of annual benchmark variable as discussed in Section 5;
- opinions on the industries proposed to be covered as outlined in Section 4;
- opinions on the proposed priorities for quarterly indicator variables outlined in Section 6;
- opinions on the proposed approach for quality evaluation and benchmarking as outlined in Section 8.

2. Review of existing sources of unit labour cost indexes

Bureau of Labour Statistics

5 The United States Bureau of Labour Statistics (BLS) produces annual ULC indexes for the Manufacturing sector, for the United States, Canada, Japan, France, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The basic methodology is to use total compensation of employees (CoE) in Manufacturing taken from the Annual National Accounts as the total labour cost measure and divide this by constant price value added (VA) in Manufacturing. However, some notable modifications to this general definition are:

- for France and Sweden significant taxes on payrolls and employment are added to the total labour costs measure;
- for the United States, Canada, Japan, France, Germany, Norway and Sweden the total labour cost measure includes a contribution from the self-employed, where employment estimates for the self-employed are multiplied by average labour compensation for employed persons.

OECD STAN Industrial database

6 The STAN Industrial database provides a comprehensive set of annual ULC indexes for virtually all OECD countries for all ISIC divisions and relevant aggregates of these such as Industry (ISIC divisions C_E); Business Sector Services (G_K); Total Services (G_O); Non Agricultural Business Sector¹ (C_K) and All Industries. The method used is the division of compensation of employees by constant price value added generally sourced from the OECD annual national accounts database.

European Central Bank (ECB)

7 The ECB publishes a quarterly ULC index for the Euro area for the following industries: Agriculture (A, B); Industry (C_E); Construction (F); Trade, Transport & Communication Services (G_J); Finance, Property & Business Services (K, L) and; Government Services (M_O). The method used is the division of compensation of employees from the quarterly national accounts by constant price value added.

OECD Main Economic Indicators database

8 The MEI collects and publishes national series of quarterly or monthly ULC indexes for the Manufacturing industry for Germany (monthly, Mining & Manufacturing), Japan (monthly), Spain (quarterly), United Kingdom (monthly) and the United States. The method generally used by those countries involves dividing total Gross Wages and Salaries (GWS) by gross output.

9 It is possible that NSOs in other OECD countries may also publish ULC indexes. Consequently, STESEG representatives of NSOs are requested to report on this issue for their country in response to this paper, providing a description of the methodology used and which industries are covered.

¹ Excluding SIC 70 – Real Estate activities

10 The OECD's *Economic Outlook* database, published at 6 monthly intervals, contains time series for the following quarterly ULC indexes including two year ahead forecasts:

- ULC – unit labour cost of total economy;
- ULCB – unit labour cost in the business sector;
- ULCM – unit labour cost of the manufacturing sector.

11 The sources used for these series are extremely varied and computations involve a large number of approximations, interpolations and use of proxy indicators. It is therefore difficult to make true international comparisons from the data or to understand the processes applied. Consequently, the development of a transparent process which provides internationally comparable output is desired.

3. Key methodological issues to consider when estimating ULC indexes

12 The simplest approach for estimating a ULC index is to divide compensation of employees by constant price value added (measured at basic prices) using data from national accounts sources (i.e. annual and / or quarterly depending on the frequency required). However, there are three main problems with applying this simplistic approach, particularly from the viewpoint of achieving comparability across countries.

1. Ownership of Dwellings

13 The national accounts item 'Ownership of Dwellings' which contributes to ISIC division K, sub-division 70: Real Estate, contributes on average around 10% of GDP in most OECD countries². This 'output' is essentially a national accounts concept and in reality has nothing to do with the relationship between output and labour costs and thus should ideally be removed from calculations of ULC indexes which cover ISIC division K. If included it has the potential to distort the comparability of ULC indexes across countries, in particular where there are large differences in the level or, more importantly, changes over time across countries in the contribution of 'Ownership of Dwellings' to value added.

2. Exclusion of the self-employed

14 Compensation of employees as defined in the national accounts does not include labour compensation for the self-employed which is covered in the item 'operating surplus and mixed income'. However, the output of the self-employed contributes to value added and thus introduces an inconsistency between the numerator and denominator when deriving ULC indexes. If an adjustment is not made to the labour compensation measure to account for the impact of the self-employed, this has the potential to distort the comparability of ULC indexes across countries if there are large differences in the level or, more importantly, changes over time in the number of self-employed persons across countries. Also, this impact is likely to vary across industries, as some industries are more likely to have a higher proportion of self-employed persons (e.g. Agriculture) than others.

² Taken from a quote in the metadata from the OECD STAN industrial database

3. Taxes on employment

15 Taxes on employment to business (e.g. payroll tax), which can be an important labour cost, are included in value added at basic prices but are not included in compensation of employees. Conceptually this is a problem because an increase in say the rate of payroll tax, all other things being equal, would cause a fall in the ULC index (as value added increases whilst compensation of employees is unchanged) when in fact it should cause an increase. Consequently if an adjustment is not made to account for taxes on employment comparability of ULC indexes across countries may be adversely affected, particularly if there are large differences in the level or, more importantly, changes over time across countries in taxes on employment.

16 The major problem in overcoming these conceptual issues is the availability of required data to make the necessary adjustments. In particular, if the data required to make these adjustments exists for some countries and not others then making the adjustments where possible introduces another factor to distort international comparability. Also, making such adjustments to source data on a quarterly basis is unlikely to be operationally feasible.

4. Industries proposed to be covered

17 The selection of industries for which this project aims to produce quarterly ULC indexes is essentially a compromise between the priorities of likely user needs and the availability of sufficiently reliable data. There appears to be a clear or at least traditional demand to produce quarterly ULC indexes for the Manufacturing industry, and the *Economic Outlook* dataset also contains estimates for total business sector and total economy. The fact that quarterly ULC indexes for service industries are not widely published may reflect an historical lack of data availability rather than an absence of demand. Consequently this project proposes to estimate quarterly ULC indexes for service industries where possible. Therefore, based on an initial investigation of data availability and perceived user demand, it is proposed to produce quarterly ULC indexes for the following industries and aggregates.

1. *Whole Economy*
2. *Industry (ISIC C_E: Mining; Manufacturing; Electricity, Gas & Water)*
3. *Manufacturing (ISIC D)*
4. *Construction (ISIC F)*
5. *Market Services (ISIC G_K: Retail & Wholesale Trade; Accommodation & Restaurants; Transport & Communication; Finance; Property & Business Services)*
6. *Business Sector excluding Agriculture (ISIC C_K)*

18 Note that the Business Sector would ideally be defined on an institutional sector basis but due to a lack of available data it is necessary to approximate this by an aggregation of the most appropriate industries³. This choice of industries should also be considered as preliminary and can be altered if there is strong user demand for other industries or aggregations.

³ Also, as discussed above it would be desirable to exclude 'Ownership of Dwellings' which is the main contributor to ISIC sub division 70: real estate, from the ULC indexes for Whole Economy, Market Services and Business Sector excluding Agriculture.

5. Choice of annual benchmark variable

19 There appear to be three possible choices as to the source for compiling annual benchmark ULC indexes for the desired industries listed above, each with some advantages and disadvantages.

Bureau of Labour Statistics

20 The BLS is one of the primary benchmark sources for the OECD's *Economic Outlook*; however it only contains annual data for 13 countries and only for manufacturing. The BLS does make adjustments for employment taxes and the self-employed but only for a selection of countries as outlined in paragraph 5.

OECD STAN Industrial database

21 The STAN Industrial database provides a comprehensive set of annual ULC indexes which could be used as a benchmark for virtually all OECD countries and for all of the desired industry breakdowns. It also provides ULC indexes for the Business Sector excluding Agriculture minus ISIC sub-division 70 (Real Estate), although only for 20 countries due to a lack of data availability in some countries.

OECD Annual National Accounts database

22 The OECD Annual National Accounts (ANA) database contains comprehensive data for the majority of OECD countries with required industry breakdowns for constant price value added⁴ and compensation of employees. It also contains data for the self-employed for some countries in some industries which may allow adjustments to be made to compensation of employees. Similarly, data on imputed rents for households taken from household final consumption expenditure tables could be used as an approximation of ownership of dwellings and be subtracted from constant price value added, but only for 19 countries. However, this source does not provide information on employment taxes.

Analysis of potential annual benchmark sources

23 One advantage of using ANA data is that adjustments could be made to both the numerator (i.e. compensation of employees) and the denominator (i.e. constant price value added) to account for the self-employed and ownership of dwellings. However this would also introduce a degree of inconsistency between countries because data does not exist in all countries to perform these adjustments. In addition, these adjustments are unlikely to be possible for the quarterly indicator series and thus their impact would only come through revisions via application of the benchmarking process after the annual data become available. Having the numerator and denominator as separate input variables would also allow them to be benchmarked separately to their quarterly indicators⁵.

24 It is possible that different sources could be used as the annual benchmark variable for different industries and aggregates, although this would complicate the transparency of the process when explained to users.

⁴ However value added data are not available for the proposed Business Services and Business Sector excluding Agriculture aggregates, which would need to be compiled from their component industries. This may present a methodological problem for those countries using annual chain linking as constant price estimates of value added are not additive.

⁵ This issue is explored further below in the Section on Evaluation and benchmarking.

25 Ultimately the Statistics Directorate (STD) would like to seek the opinion of potential key users before choosing the annual benchmark variable, thus feedback from STESEG participants is sought on whether in principle it is preferable to:

- take the most simplistic approach which would be consistent across all countries by using compensation of employees divided by value added and obtain all annual benchmark data from one source (i.e. STAN or ANA), or;
- try to obtain the most methodologically correct annual benchmark for each country within each industry. This will depend on the availability of data to make the required adjustments to compensation of employees and constant price value added.

6. Choice of quarterly indicator variables

26 It is proposed to benchmark quarterly indicator variables to their annual counterparts using a statistical procedure for which different options are discussed below in the Section 8 on Evaluation and benchmarking. Constant price value added (VA) and compensation of employees (CoE) from the quarterly national accounts (QNA) are considered the target quarterly indicator variables for the ULC index. That is, it is not realistic to consider making adjustments on a quarterly basis to account for the deficiencies in these variables for forming an ideal ULC index. However, these variables are not available from the QNA for a large number of OECD countries or for the degree of industry detail required. Consequently, proxy variables will need to be considered and a priority between possible alternative proxy variables needs to be established. The following processes have been used to identify and prioritise proxy variables to guide the data collection process. Ideally, all quarterly indicator data used in this analysis would be seasonally adjusted, provided seasonality exists in the associated series.

Constant price value added

Target variable: Constant price VA at basic prices by required industries from the QNA

Proxy variable: Gross output indicator, e.g. index of production

Compensation of employees

Target variable: Compensation of employees by required industries from the QNA

Proxy variables: In decreasing order of preference as shown below.

1 Gross wages and salaries

27 Gross wages and salaries forms the major part of CoE and may be available on an industry basis where CoE is only provided at more aggregated levels within a country's QNA.

2 Labour cost index multiplied by an index of hours worked

28 A labour cost index should be defined as an index which measures changes in gross labour costs per hour worked. It should not be adjusted for quality or compositional changes and should have the broadest possible scope in terms of coverage of labour costs. The ideal measure of labour input is total hours paid. The scope would generally be paid employees (i.e. exclude the self-employed) unless the annual benchmark for compensation of employees was adjusted for the self-employed in which case hours paid for total employment would be preferred if available (i.e. includes the self-employed).

3 *Hourly earnings index multiplied by an index of hours worked*

29 An hourly earnings index should have the broadest possible scope of employee earnings (i.e. capture all workers such as those employed full-time (FT) and part-time (PT), and all earnings such as overtime and bonuses etc.). The ideal measure of labour input is total hours paid. The scope would generally be paid employees (i.e. exclude the self-employed) unless the annual benchmark for compensation of employees was adjusted for the self-employed in which case hours paid for total employment would be preferred if available (i.e. includes the self-employed).

4 *Weekly or monthly earnings multiplied by an employment measure*

30 A weekly or monthly average earnings index should have the broadest possible scope of employee earnings (i.e. capture all workers such as FT and PT, and all earnings such as overtime and bonuses etc.). The required measure of labour input would be total employees⁶ (i.e. excluding the self-employed), unless the annual benchmark for compensation of employees was adjusted for the self-employed in which case total civilian employment would be preferred if available.

7. Availability of quarterly indicator variables

31 The matrix in Attachment 1 provides a comprehensive reference of data availability by OECD country for calculating quarterly ULC indexes on the basis of the preferred quarterly variables as outlined above. This matrix was established after an investigation of potential data sources ranging from OECD databases (Quarterly National Accounts – QNA, and Main Economic Indicators – MEI), Eurostat (New Cronos) databases, investigations of Member country national statistical organisations’ websites and by emailing well established country contacts (for a small number of countries).

Data available from the OECD Quarterly National Accounts database

32 The OECD QNA database maintained by the Statistics Directorate (STD) is the central repository for all QNA data received by STD. All countries are asked to complete a quarterly questionnaire that is then fed into the database. The questionnaire has been harmonised with Eurostat and in some cases the data is received from Eurostat directly. QNA is the preferred data source for both constant price value added and compensation of employees and for a large percentage of Member countries both these statistics are available.

33 The QNA database aims to provide the standard A6 industry breakdown: Agriculture (A_B); Industry (C_E); Construction (F); Retail & Wholesale Trade, Accommodation & Restaurants, Transport & Communication (G_I); Finance, Property & Business Services (J_K); Other Services (L_O). A limited number of countries provide additional disaggregations, which for the purpose of this project is required for Manufacturing (D). The desired aggregates of Market Services (G_K) and Business Sector excluding Agriculture (C_K) are not available and need to be estimated. As CoE data is in current prices this is a simple case of adding together the component industries data. However for constant price VA data such an addition is not strictly correct where countries produce annually chain-linked volume indexes⁷, although it

⁶ Using an index of hours worked in conjunction with an average or monthly earnings index would cause a bias if there were a shift between the proportion of full-time and part-time employees

⁷ This is the case, or will be case by the end of 2005, for almost all OECD Member countries.

is planned to ignore this issue in this project unless a more methodologically correct practical alternative can be found.

34 The QNA database can supply all the required constant price VA data for eight countries and all but Manufacturing for a further 16 countries. For CoE, the QNA database can supply all the required data with the exception of Manufacturing for 11 countries⁸ and CoE at the total level only for a further 3 countries.

Sources for proxy quarterly indicators

35 As outlined in paragraphs 26 above, where QNA data is not available proxy sources need to be considered. For constant price VA, the main area not satisfied by the QNA database is for Manufacturing. However, proxy data in the form of an index of industrial production for Manufacturing exists for all required countries in the MEI database. There are a few areas where no suitable proxy data was found for constant price VA and these are indicated in purple in the data availability matrix in Attachment 1. The countries with missing data in some of the required industry breakdowns that are of major concern are Japan and the United States.

36 The need for proxy indicators of CoE is much greater, but as outlined in paragraphs 27-30, there can be a number of options for these proxy indicators. However, the further one moves from the target indicator the suitability of the proxy indicator for producing quarterly ULC indexes is likely to become more questionable. Data for gross wages and salaries (GWS), the preferred proxy variable, exists for at least some of the required industries for 18 countries. There is a split between the EU countries that can only provide GWS data for Manufacturing (D), Industry (C_E) and Construction (F) and non EU countries who can provide GWS data for most of the breakdowns required. The GWS data for the EU countries can be downloaded directly from Eurostat whereas for the other countries this data can be found on their NSO websites.

37 There are six countries where the proxy for CoE will be calculated using their labour cost index (LCI) *multiplied by* hours worked. These are all EU countries⁹ and as such the data can be provided by Eurostat. Eight countries will provide a CoE proxy for at least one industry using weekly or monthly earnings data *multiplied by* employees. All of this data will be sourced from either the NSO website or the MEI database. Japan is the only large OECD country where a proxy for CoE cannot be found for some of the required industry breakdowns.

38 STESEG representatives from NSOs are asked to carefully study the data availability matrix in Attachment 1 and indicate if they disagree with the choice of variables proposed for their country, would like to make comments on the likely quality of the quarterly indicator variables proposed to be used¹⁰, or suggest suitable alternative indicator variables.

⁸ These 11 countries are all from the European Union, and there is a push for other EU countries to produce this data as part of the Principal European Economic Indicators (PEEI) initiative.

⁹ The labour cost index data published by Eurostat is only published by the national institutes for Sweden, Portugal, Spain, Belgium and Finland. This may raise questions regarding data quality for the other countries that are not prepared to publish this data.

¹⁰ For some countries seasonally adjusted data is not provided. In these cases the OECD would create the required seasonally adjusted series.

8. Evaluation and Benchmarking

39 This Section outlines a range of technical issues that will need to be taken into account when estimating and evaluating the quality of the quarterly ULC indexes produced in this project.

8.1 Combining industries to form required aggregates

40 As noted previously in this paper, direct estimates for Market Services (G_K) and Business Sector excluding Agriculture (C_K) will not be available and will therefore have to be aggregated from individual industry components. The following method is proposed for the different types of quarterly indicator variables available.

- for constant price VA, relevant industry estimates will be summed¹¹;
- for constant price VA proxies, namely indices of industrial production, aggregate annually chain-linked indexes will be created by using weights for the contributing industry segments derived from annual constant price VA data;
- for CoE, relevant industry estimates will be summed;
- for GWS as a proxy for CoE, the GWS data will be expressed in index form and aggregate annually chain linked indexes will be created by using weights derived from annual CoE data for the contributing industry segments;
- for LCI*hours or Earnings*Employee as a proxy for CoE, all inputs will be expressed as indices and multiplied together to form a proxy index of CoE. Aggregate annually chain-linked indexes using weights derived from annual CoE data for the contributing industry segments will then be calculated.

8.2 Assessment of quarterly indicator variables

Comparison with annual benchmark

41 The quarterly indicator variables proposed in the data availability matrix in Attachment 1 will be assessed in a number of ways to determine their suitability for producing quarterly ULC indexes. The first requirement will be to observe the relationship between a proxy annual ULC index derived from the proposed quarterly indicator series in comparison to the true annual benchmark ULC index. In addition, comparisons between annual benchmarks and quarterly indicators for the components (i.e. quarterly indicators for constant price VA and CoE) could also be made. Basic techniques to compare these series would be to:

- view graphs of the annual benchmark variables compared to the temporally aggregated quarterly indicators;
- assess the correlation between the proxy and benchmark measures at annual level, obviously with the higher the value of this correlation the better. This assessment can also be done through a regression with the annual series derived from the quarterly indicator series as a predictor of the annual benchmark series (with series expressed as indices and / or as an annual growth rate series). In this case

¹¹ This will provide only an approximate measure for the majority of OECD countries who produce annually chain-linked volume indices which are not strictly additive across industries

the usual diagnostic checks for a regression model (R-squared, t-stats, residual analysis) should be performed. A possible dynamic relationship between the quarterly indicator and the annual benchmark measure should also be tested¹²;

42 Where the proposed quarterly indicator variables are from the QNA, it is likely that for most countries the historical quarterly series for constant price VA and CoE will already have been benchmarked to the countries annual national accounts yielding the above analysis redundant¹³. However in many cases, as seen in the data assessment matrix in Attachment 1, it is proposed to use QNA as the source for constant price VA but some other source as a proxy for CoE. In this case, it would be useful to evaluate more closely the quality of the quarterly proxy indicator for CoE which will directly influence the quality of the resultant ULC index. Also, if it is decided to perform adjustments to the annual benchmark sources of constant price VA and CoE to account for employment taxes, self-employed etc. (see paragraphs 12-16) then the types of evaluations described above will still be relevant where QNA is the quarterly source.

Other assessments of quality

43 Another important issue will be to assess the consistency between specific industry ULC indexes and their aggregates. Comparisons of quarterly ULC indexes produced through this project with those currently compiled nationally would also need to be made and any significant differences explained.

44 The size of revisions for the quarterly ULC indexes which arise from revisions to the input source series is also an issue of interest. This may be difficult to consider in the initial stages of this project which will use historical time series which are generally not subject to further revisions. However this is an issue that should be closely evaluated when experimental estimates start to be produced on a quarterly basis.

8.3 Benchmarking

Historical benchmarking

45 It is proposed that the quarterly ULC indexes be ‘benchmarking’ to their respective annual ULC indexes. This benchmarking process essentially adjusts the quarterly indicator series to be consistent with the annual benchmark series and there are a variety of benchmarking methodologies available to perform this reconciliation. This project proposes to use standard benchmarking techniques as those by Denton (1971) and Chow and Lin (1971), along with other procedures adapted to deal with log-transformed and/or trended data (Fernández, 1981, Di Fonzo, 2003). As discussed in paragraph 42, the benchmarking process will not be required if all the annual and quarterly source data is from the national accounts.

46 As mentioned previously in this paper, another important issue is whether the quarterly ULC indexes or their components should be benchmarked to their annual counterparts. That is, one could consider benchmarking the quarterly proxy indicators of CoE (i.e. the numerator of the ULC index) and constant price VA (i.e. the denominator of the ULC index) to their annual counterparts and thus deriving

¹² The rationale behind this proposal is that, if the ‘true’ quarterly Data Generating Process takes the simple first order dynamic form $y_{t,h} = \phi y_{t-1,h} + \mathbf{x}'_{t,h} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_{t,h}$, $t=1, \dots, T$, $h=1,2,3,4$, the annual model implied by temporal aggregation is $y_t = \phi^4 y_{t-1} + \mathbf{x}'_t \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_t$, $t=1, \dots, T$, where in both cases ε is a white noise error term.

¹³ In this case, it is proposed to accept the quarterly ULC index as the best measure possible

the final benchmarked quarterly ULC index, rather than benchmarking the quarterly indicator ULC index directly. Performing benchmarking of the component series would facilitate a broader range of analyses as described within this Section and consequently is the method proposed to be used in this project. However benchmarking the ULC index directly may be easier from an operational sense and could be the only option possible if the input components are not readily available from the annual benchmark source (e.g. if BLS is used as a source for the annual benchmark ULC index for some countries).

47 The historical benchmarking process will allow further detailed assessment of the likely quality of the quarterly indicator series – by reviewing the direction and magnitude of the revisions to the quarterly indicator series arising from the benchmarking process.

Preliminary benchmarking / Nowcasting

48 The purpose of this project is to produce the most reliable quarterly ULC indexes possible. Therefore, the historical relationship between the quarterly indicator variables and their annual benchmarks determined in the historical benchmarking process described above should be used when estimating the quarterly ULC indexes in real time. The methodologies used for historical benchmarking will also generate a preliminary benchmarked series. That is, a series which uses the quarterly indicator variables to extend the time series based on the benchmarking model. These estimates should be compared with some `basic` procedures for preliminary benchmarking, e.g. extrapolation via rates of change of the indicator series.

49 The method proposed to evaluate the forecasting performance of the above models is to conduct a rolling-forecast experiment. In other words, to use say m years to calculate one-year-ahead quarterly forecasts: m annual auxiliary regressions are estimated up to year T , then $T+1, \dots, T+m-1$, and the relevant quarterly forecasts for year $T+1, \dots, T+m$ are calculated, yearly aggregated and, finally, compared to the annual historical record of the series in terms of RMSE. To get significant results, at least 6 or more years should be considered in the experiment. An important by-product of this work is the ability of evaluating (by simple graphs) the constancy of the estimated parameters of the auxiliary regression model.

8.4 Final evaluation of quarterly indicator variables

50 After the application of the above tests arising from the analysis of available historical time series, there will need to be some form of overall assessment made and consequent recommendations. These will propose whether the available quarterly indicator variables appear to be of sufficient quality to use for producing quarterly ULC indexes on an ongoing basis. Following this, an experimental set of quarterly ULC indexes would be produced, being updated on a monthly basis. A process of ongoing review to assess the performance of these indexes would then be undertaken.

9. Feedback being sought and planned future work

51 This investigation has so far revealed that significant potential exists to produce a comprehensive set of comparable quarterly unit labour costs indexes across the majority of OECD countries for a broad range of industries and interesting aggregates. Before proceeding further with this work as outlined below, feedback on the following key issues is requested from STESEG representatives:

- details from those NSOs (or other institutions) currently producing quarterly ULC indexes, outlining the methodology used and the industries covered;

- reactions from NSOs to the data availability matrix in Attachment 1. For example, are these the best sources of data available for your country? In particular, does appropriate data exist for the components that we have listed as having no available data?
- opinions on the possible choices of annual benchmark variable as discussed in Section 5;
- opinions on the industries proposed to be covered as outlined in Section 4;
- opinions on the proposed priorities for quarterly indicator variables outlined in Section 6;
- opinions on the proposed approach for quality evaluation and benchmarking as outlined in Section 8.

Plans for future work

52 The following points summarise the key elements of future work proposed for this project:

- obtain feedback on the specific proposals outlined in this paper from STESEG and potential internal and external users;
- finalise the data sources to be used and extract the relevant data;
- estimate historical time series and submit these to the evaluation and benchmarking processes;
- present results to STESEG and selected internal and external users with recommendations on which quarterly ULC indexes are sufficiently reliable to be produced on an ongoing basis;
- develop a process for producing experimental quarterly ULC indexes, updated on a monthly basis;
- ongoing review and evaluation including comparisons for consistency with existing ULCs, particularly those produced by NSOs;
- official publication in OECD products.

Short-Term Economic Statistics Division
 Statistics Directorate
 OECD

29 April 2005

Attachment 1: Quarterly indicator variable data availability matrix

Country	Total		D		C_E		F		G_K		C_K(7)	
	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE
Australia	QNA	QNA	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS
Austria	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Belgium	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Canada	QNA	QNA	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS
Czech (1)	QNA	Earnings * Employee	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours
Denmark	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Finland (4)	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours
France	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Germany	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Greece												
Hungary	QNA	Earnings * Employee	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours
Iceland	QNA	Earnings * Employee										
Ireland	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Italy	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Japan (5)	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	Earnings * Employee		Earnings * Employee				Earnings * Employee		
Korea	QNA	Earnings * Employee	IPI - MEI	Earnings * Employee	IPI - MEI	Earnings * Employee			MEI	Earnings * Employee		
Luxembourg			QNA	Employee	QNA	Employee	QNA	Employee	QNA	Employee	QNA	Employee
Mexico (2)	QNA		QNA	GWS	QNA		QNA		QNA		QNA	
Netherlands	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
New Zealand (3)	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee

Country	Total		D		C_E		F		G_K		C_K(7)	
	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE	VA	CoE
Norway (8)	QNA		QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee	QNA	Earnings * Employee
Poland	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Portugal (9)	QNA	LCI*Hours	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours
Slovakia	QNA	Earnings * Employee	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours
Spain	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Sweden	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	LCI*Hours	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA	QNA
Switzerland												
Turkey	QNA	QNA	QNA		QNA		QNA		QNA		QNA	
United Kingdom	QNA	QNA	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	GWS or LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours	QNA	LCI*Hours
United States	QNA	QNA	IPI - MEI	GWS	IPI - MEI	GWS	IPI - MEI	GWS	QNA	GWS	QNA	GWS

Not going to calculate

Data needed

Footnotes:

1. Earnings come from MEI and total employees come from EuroStat.
2. It could be possible to publish CoE Total and F but there is an issue with the Mexican employee numbers data that will need to be resolved first.
3. All data would have to come from the QES - Weekly Earnings, Weekly Paid Hours, Employees (excludes agriculture).
4. Country contact has suggested that GWS be used.
5. Employee numbers come from the QLFS.
7. In some cases summary components don't exist, weighting the sub-components will be required to compute the total.
8. Country contacted about missing data but no response to date.
9. CoE at the Total level excludes L_O but this could change after a feasibility study currently underway.

Table Definition:

VA: Chained Constant Prices, Gross Total Value Added at Basic Prices

CoE: Compensation of Employees at Current Prices

QNA: Quarterly National Accounts data sourced directly from the OECD's QNA database

IPI - MEI: Index of Industrial Production for manufacturing (D) or total industry (C_E) sourced via MEI database

GWS: Gross Wages and Salaries, sourced via either EuroStat or NSOs.

LCI*Hours: Labour Cost Index multiplied by Hours Worked sourced via EuroStat

Earning*Employees: Weekly/monthly earnings sourced via either MEI or NSOs multiplied by employees sourced via either EuroStat, MEI or NSOs

References on benchmarking

Chow G. and A.L. Lin (1971), Best linear unbiased interpolation, distribution and extrapolation of time series by related series, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 53: 372-375.

Denton F.T. (1971), Adjustment of monthly or quarterly series to annual totals: An approach based on quadratic minimization, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 66: 99-102.

Di Fonzo T. (2003), Temporal disaggregation using related series: log-transformation and dynamic extensions, *Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Economiche e Commerciali*, 50, 3, pp. 371-400.

Fernández R.B. (1981), A methodological note on the estimation of time series, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 63: 471-478.