

JOINT OIL DATA INITIATIVE

Newsletter



Since the last JODI Newsletter, the assessment of JODI data quality has been the priority task of the organizations and the Review Committee. A preliminary report for every country has been sent to the organizations by the independent oil analyst. He is now working on a final report, to be presented at the next Review Committee meeting. The report will contain his assessment of the quality of the JODI data, complemented with input received from the organizations based on their own analysis.

At the same time the organizations are already solving problems raised in the preliminary report.

At the IEFS the installation of the database

and user interface has been completed. Tests are now underway to ensure that JODI data are processed the same way than before and that the new system will not have any negative effects for the JODI users.

As always the organizations continue their work on developing and improving the JODI data, however much remains to be done. A sustained effort is still required to ensure that the launch of the JODI database meets expectations.

In this issue:

- | | |
|--|---|
| - The Review Committee | 1 |
| - Participation of Countries in JODI | 2 |
| - Participation of Countries in JODI (table) | 3 |

The Review Committee⁽¹⁾

The independent oil consultant has now finished the first part of his work. The quality of the data of 54 countries that are either in the top 30 producing, top 30 consuming and top 30 stock holding countries has been assessed. Outstanding issues have been identified and sent to the relevant organizations for comment and resolution.

In the report, the oil consultant focused his assessment of the JODI data on comparison with national and secondary sources. When no other sources were available, internal consistency checks have been run. However the relative deviation of JODI data from other sources can only be taken as an indicator when assessing the quality of JODI data. There is not a single source which can claim to hold the “definitive” data set and which could therefore serve as a benchmark for the JODI data. The work carried out by the oil consultant in addition to the checks/analysis already performed by the organizations should enable the Review Committee to build a more complete picture of the quality of the JODI data and identify where progress still remains to be made.

On June 1st the Review Committee members organized a conference call to provide to the consultant further feedback on the results submitted as well as improvements to be made in the final report.

The consultant will present his final report on the quality of the JODI data on June 20th at the second Review Committee meeting. This meeting will take place at the IEA Headquarters in Paris, back-to-back with an Inter-organizational JODI meeting on June 21st. Participants will discuss and agree in principal on details of the launch of the JODI World database and among other issues the timing of the next JODI Conference.

(1) The role of the Review Committee is to assess the quality of the JODI data. The Review Committee comprises representatives of each organization (one statistician plus one oil analyst when possible). The Committee is chaired by the IEFS.

Contact List

IEFS: Mr. Kazuo Kawahara
kazuo.kawahara@iefs.org.sa
EUROSTAT: Mr. Pekka Loesonen
pekka.loesonen@cec.eu.int
APEC: Mr. Shigeru Kimura
kimura@edmc.ieej.or.jp
IEA: Mr. Jean-Yves Garnier
jean-yves.garnier@iea.org
OLADE: Mr. Alejandro Villarreal
avillarreal@olade.org.ec
OPEC: Dr. Muhammad Al-Tayyeb
tayyebma@opec.org
UNSD: Mr. Karoly Kovacs
kovacs@un.org
Newsletter: Mr. Bruno Castellano
bruno.castellano@iefs.org.sa

Participation of Countries in JODI

At the 9th International Energy Forum in Amsterdam in May 2004, the six organizations presented a table depicting the participation of countries in JODI. The time period used to evaluate the timeliness, completeness and sustainability of the submissions was July-December 2003.

One year later, the JODI partners repeated the exercise to evaluate the progress made to date. They used the same methodology but the time period for the assessment now covered July-December 2004 (see table below).

The results are encouraging. Compared to the last exercise, 4 countries were added to the list as they have submitted data for more than a year on a regular basis – coverage is improving. Moreover Croatia has just joined the Initiative and has been submitting data since January 2005. However, 14 countries have now a lower rating for the sustainability of their submission while only 10 countries improve it. Almost one third of the countries have 3 “Good” smiley faces but 9 countries are still characterized by 3 “Poor” or unhappy faces.

Sustainability and completeness of the submissions is rated as good for more than two thirds of the participating countries but timeliness remains a problem for half of them and 27 countries are rated as poor with regard to the timeliness of their submissions.

At this critical stage in the development of the database the JODI partners reiterate their call for all participating countries to redouble their effort to send timely, complete and reliable submissions.

Participation of Countries in JODI

Algeria	☹	☹	☹
Angola	☹	☹	☹
Argentina	n.a	n.a	n.a
Australia	☹	☹	☹
Austria	☹	☹	☹
Barbados	n.a	n.a	n.a
Belgium	☹	☹	☹
Bolivia	n.a	n.a	n.a
Brazil	n.a	n.a	n.a
Brunei Darussalam	☹	☹	☹
Bulgaria	☹	☹	☹
Cameroon	☹	☹	☹
Canada	☹	☹	☹
Chile	☹	☹	☹
China	☹	☹	☹
Chinese Taipei	☹	☹	☹
Colombia	n.a	n.a	n.a
Congo	☹	☹	☹
Costa Rica	n.a	n.a	n.a
Cuba	n.a	n.a	n.a
Cyprus	☹	☹	☹
Czech Republic	☹	☹	☹
Denmark	☹	☹	☹
Dominican Republic	n.a	n.a	n.a
Ecuador	n.a	n.a	n.a
Egypt (Arab Rep.)	☹	☹	☹
El Salvador	n.a	n.a	n.a
Estonia	☹	☹	☹
Finland	☹	☹	☹
France	☹	☹	☹
Gabon	☹	☹	☹
Germany	☹	☹	☹
Greece	☹	☹	☹
Grenada	n.a	n.a	n.a
Guatemala	n.a	n.a	n.a
Guyana	n.a	n.a	n.a
Haiti	n.a	n.a	n.a
Honduras	n.a	n.a	n.a
Hong Kong, China	☹	☹	☹
Hungary	☹	☹	☹
Iceland	☹	☹	☹
India	☹	☹	☹
Indonesia	☹	☹	☹
Iran (Islamic Rep.)	☹	☹	☹
Ireland	☹	☹	☹
Italy	☹	☹	☹
Jamaica	n.a	n.a	n.a
Japan	☹	☹	☹
Kazakhstan	☹	☹	☹
Korea	☹	☹	☹
Kuwait	☹	☹	☹
Latvia	☹	☹	☹
Libya	☹	☹	☹
Lithuania	☹	☹	☹
Luxembourg	☹	☹	☹
Malaysia	☹	☹	☹
Mexico	☹	☹	☹
Myanmar	☹	☹	☹
Netherlands	☹	☹	☹
New Zealand	☹	☹	☹
Nicaragua	n.a	n.a	n.a
Nigeria	☹	☹	☹
Norway	☹	☹	☹
Oman	☹	☹	☹
Panama	n.a	n.a	n.a
Papua New Guinea	☹	☹	☹
Paraguay	n.a	n.a	n.a
Peru	☹	☹	☹
Philippines	☹	☹	☹
Poland	☹	☹	☹
Portugal	☹	☹	☹
Qatar	☹	☹	☹
Romania	☹	☹	☹
Russian Federation	☹	☹	☹
Saudi Arabia	☹	☹	☹
Singapore	☹	☹	☹
Slovak Republic	☹	☹	☹
Slovenia	☹	☹	☹
South Africa	☹	☹	☹
Spain	☹	☹	☹
Surinam	n.a	n.a	n.a
Sweden	☹	☹	☹
Switzerland	☹	☹	☹
Syria (Arab Rep.)	☹	☹	☹
Thailand	☹	☹	☹
Trinidad & Tobago	n.a	n.a	n.a
Turkey	☹	☹	☹
United Arab Emirates	☹	☹	☹
United Kingdom	☹	☹	☹
United States	☹	☹	☹
Uruguay	n.a	n.a	n.a
Venezuela*	☹	☹	☹
Vietnam	☹	☹	☹
Yemen	☹	☹	☹

Categories of participation, as of the period July-December 2004.

Croatia started its participation after July 2004, and therefore is not graded.

* OPEC assessment.

☹☹☹ Submission

☹☹☹ Timeliness

☹☹☹ Completeness

☺ Good ☹ Fair ☹ Poor

<http://www.oil-data-transparency.org>