



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS
STATISTICS DIVISION
UNITED NATIONS

**Global Consultation Draft
Guidelines on
Integrated Economic
Statistics**

Comment Form

Draft Guidelines on Integrated Economic Statistics

Send responses to: sna@un.org
Deadline: 10 January 2011

Your name:	Mrs Aija Žīgure
Your country/organization:	Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia
Contact (e.g. email address):	csb@csb.gov.lv

To submit responses please save the completed form and send it as an attachment to the following e-mail address: sna@un.org by Monday, 10 January 2011. You are encouraged to submit a short response to the questions (yes/no/no comment) even if you have no further comments to offer in the comment boxes. Please focus your comments on substantive issues since a final edit of the Guidelines will be conducted after the February 2011 Statistical Commission meeting.

Relevant documents

The draft publication is available on the global consultation website:
<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/nationalaccount/ies/>

Questions

1. Do you agree that the *Guidelines* covers well the practical aspects and experiences of the integration of economic statistics?

Yes ☒ No ☐ No comment ☐

Comment:

The draft Guidelines can be considered as a quite comprehensive and useful document, especially for those countries, which carry out a re-design or modernization of national statistical system. It is a valuable methodological material and provides examples of good praxis.

However, the draft should be reviewed to avoid many unnecessary repetitions. It would be better to introduce references to other/previous chapters/paragraphs where particular issue is already described.

2. Do you consider that the *Guidelines* takes due note of the difficulties faced by countries in the integrated collection, compilation and dissemination of economic statistics?

Yes ☐ No ☒ No comment ☐

Comment:

As far the major part of the draft is compiled in the form of “should”, giving nice guidelines what is an ideal system to reach for, we did not recognize a sound accent on particular difficulties. They can be understood by each country trying to compare its real situation with those conditions mentioned in the guidelines – in that case substantial deviations may be discovered.

3. Were there any aspects of integration which you feel have not been sufficiently well-covered?

Yes ☐ No ☐ No comment ☒

Comment:

Click here and start typing

4. Do you find the case studies useful and practical?

Yes ☒ No ☐ No comment ☐

Comment:

5. Would you like to make or seek any specific elaborations in Chapter 1 to Chapter 7 or in the Annexes?

Yes ☒ No ☐ No comment ☐

Comment:

Chapter 1: Executive summary could be without chapter numbering (or chapter “zero”) because it shows the essence of all other chapters. However, it would be better to avoid usage of exactly the same wording or the same sentences/paragraphs.

Chapter 2: Some proof reading is needed. Repetition of the same text – a part of paragraph 21 (page 21) makes almost the whole paragraph 28 (page 23).

Chapter 3: That chapter in some extent also looks like executive summary because a big part of it is devoted to issues, which are further elaborated in the following chapters. Cleaning out some paragraphs would eliminate such perception of the chapter.

Chapter 4: Almost full repetition about objectives, which can be achieved by regular relationship meetings (page 69 and page 70), it does not matter whether these meetings are held for producers of statistics or those institutions maintaining administrative sources. The

goals can be listed for the first occasion and reference given for the second.

Chapter 5: Perhaps, too much attention is given to explanations about different statistical units and their types. The same information in a detailed manner can be taken from methodological texts on SNA but in EU case – from ESA and particular regulation on statistical units. Such an extensive explanation is acceptable if the target group of the Guidelines is outside statistical offices.

Chapter 6: Paragraph 12 – it is not fully clear what is meant by “alternative macroeconomic datasets”. Formally, it is under the question whether paragraphs on SDMX fit to issue named “dissemination”. Maybe, it would be better to introduce special sub-title and to group under it all paragraphs with description of that data exchange standard.

It is not also understandable, why paragraphs 21 and 22 are included here.

Besides, social networks gradually start to play a bigger role in the global as well in the local communication. Would it be possible to formulate some guidelines for statisticians how to incorporate these social networks into communication with existing and/or potential users?

The point concerning social media should be added to the dissemination chapter. The growing importance of social media influences the traditional ways of searching for statistics, many debates and exchange of knowledge actually take place and a lot of stakeholders and those who create opinions in the society are there.

The handbook should provide basic principles of how to communicate in social networks, share statistics and collect feedback.

Chapter 7: That chapter clearly demonstrates how authors of these Guidelines give preference to statistical system of North America, mainly U.S. However, within global statistical system is number of countries to which U.S. experience will not be of great value. For countries with a centralized statistical system that experience makes less sense. For instance, industry classification NAICS does not make great sense for European countries, which are using NACE but that latter classification has not even been mentioned anywhere in the draft.

Regarding satellite accounts – even if just two of them (tourism and environment) are described in more detail, at least some other areas, like health, education, pensions, etc., could be named where satellite accounts can be compiled and give a great opportunity for analysts.

Environment satellite accounts – SEEA should be mentioned here as a methodological background.

Technical note - Table 1 – structure usually makes round 100 per cent when summing up, but for advance and second estimate table shows 100.1 per cent.

Annexes: Annexes 3 to 5 looks more like a case study.