UNITED NATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS
STATISTICS DIVISION

Meeting of the Expert Group on
International Statistical Classifications
New York, 19-22 May 2015

Final report

Table of contents

Introduction

1.   The meeting of the Expert Group on International Statistical Classifications, organised by the United Nations Statistics Division (UNSD) was held in New York from 19-22 May 2015.

2.   The meeting was attended by 24 experts from 19 countries and 7 international organisations.

3.   The meeting was chaired by Mr Andrew Hancock of Statistics New Zealand.

4.   The meeting was opened with a statement by Ms Eszter Horvath, on behalf of Mr Stefan Schweinfest, Director of UNSD. In her remarks, Ms Horvath noted the extensive and somewhat ambitious agenda for the meeting which reflected the enlarged scope of the work and demands for the Expert Group. She reiterated the importance of statistical classifications for the post-2015 development agenda and for supporting outcomes of the work on sustainable development goals, and the impacts of big data requirements, and the challenges of integrating geospatial and statistical data.

5.   The Chair expressed his appreciation for the contribution and support of UNSD, particularly the work of Mr Ralf Becker and his team. It was noted that the agenda was rather ambitious and that there was a lot for the Expert Group to discuss but this was a reflection of the changing nature of official statistics and the increasing need for a variety of frameworks and classifications to support production of data from a variety of sources.

6.   It was noted that Mr Hiroaki Sumida from Japan, and Mr Matthias Greulich from Germany had notified apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

7.   The meeting was organised according to several thematic topics. For each topic, a number of papers on relevant, and often interconnected issues, was available and the papers were introduced through short presentations at the beginning of each session that highlighted the main issues raised and questions posed to the Expert Group.

8.   In total, 36 papers were submitted for the meeting, accompanied by PowerPoint or oral presentations at the meeting. In addition 9 background papers were made available for Expert Group information. All papers and presentations are available on the meeting's website at: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/class/intercop/expertgroup/2015/ac289-2.asp

9.   Annex 1 shows a list of action items agreed at this meeting of the Expert Group. Annex 2 lists the Technical Subgroups to be formed or continue under the auspices of the Expert Group and Annex 3 details the composition of the Bureau.

Main discussions and conclusions

10.   The Expert Group considered a wide range of topics during its meeting, including documents addressing the work within the Family of International Statistical Classifications such as best practice guidelines and criteria to be used in deciding membership for, and quality of, classifications in the Family. In addition there were broader considerations of standards, and the review of development and revision work on a number of international classifications in cooperation with their respective custodians, better communication with classification users, national and regional efforts to further progress with implementation of revised classifications, as well as the effective management of classifications. Additional information items related to new topics of homelessness, gender identity, disaster risk related statistics and indigenous requirements. The main discussions and conclusions related to these different topics are presented below.

11.   The meeting agenda was adopted as presented and the Expert Group was given a brief report from the Chair on the work of the Bureau since the last Expert Group meeting. All but four action points from the 2013 meeting had been resolved and it was noted that Bureau meeting minutes and action items were now circulated to the Expert Group to keep them informed of progress and work on any emerging issues.

Topic 1 - Mandate and Family of International Classifications

12.   In this topic, the Expert Group considered issues related to the mandate of the Expert Group, as well as guidelines and scope for the International Family of Statistical Classifications.

Mandate of the Expert Group

13.   The mandate of the Expert Group was presented for discussion to enable members to advise whether any changes or updates be considered. The mandate is a living document and will be a permanent agenda item for expert group meetings in the future. This is to ensure it is reflective of the role envisaged for the expert group as the domains of statistical activities for which statistical classifications are required expands in the future.

14.   Discussion focussed on the visibility of the Expert Group before the UN Statistical Commission and more generally the international community. The current process of sending an information paper to the Statistical Commission meeting was discussed in terms of making this a more explicit approach particularly in relation to the implementation of international statistical classifications, rather than just when seeking approval or endorsement.

15.   A proposal was put forward that the Expert Group organise a side event at the Commission meeting to get more visibility. The Bureau was tasked with investigating the feasibility of this, and/or identifying ways to promote the visibility of the Expert Group.

There was comment proposing to link classifications with the work of the HLG on Modernisation Committee on Standards to raise visibility.

16.   The issue of whether a person specification for Expert Group members be established, and/or whether the need for membership statuses be implemented was a point for discussion. The need for an observer status was not considered necessary as the mandate was perceived to adequately cover representation within the Expert Group. Countries were able to send more than one participant if they so choose, and the mandate allows the Expert Group to bring in specialist experts if required.

17.   The option of introducing a quota (by region) or allowing wider participation upon request did lead the Expert Group to consider the issue of ensuring that the Expert Group did not have a dominant regional membership. The attendance of individual countries, particularly developing countries, is an issue of resource and capacity. Ensuring that regional organisations such as Afristat, the Secretariat for the Pacific Community or ECLAC participate in the Expert Group activities was considered a good option. No formal decision was made on these discussion points.

Criteria for Inclusion into the International Family of Statistical Classifications

18.   A revised document outlining the Criteria for Inclusion into the International Family of Statistical Classifications was presented to the meeting. An expanded scope of the Family aimed to provide countries with a more comprehensive list of recognised international classifications recommended to be used in different statistical domains, and to promote coherence between various classifications. The document was again presented as a living document, which attempted to describe in plain English, the requirements for classifications to be included in the international family. This paper formed one part of the process and was to be read in conjunction with the best practices guidelines. Once a classification had complied with the criteria requirements it still had to be evaluated against the grading criteria document.

19.   A number of issues were raised in terms of clarifying particular aspects of the document. This included versioning of classifications, statistical balance, statistical units, implementation and dissemination.

20.   It was agreed that Expert Group members would send comments to assist in clarification of those aspects noted above to the Bureau by 12 June 2015, with a revised document to be circulated back to the Expert Group in the first week of July 2015.

Grading Criteria for International Statistical Classifications

21.   This document outlined definitions for the status of classifications and the grading criteria to be applied to assess compliance of classifications to be part of an expanded International Family of Statistical Classifications. Classifications were to be graded to one of three statuses – reference, derived or related. In addition the document outlines a quality

scale to be applied when assessing the status of the classifications. The paper was presented by Valentina Ramaschiello of FAO.

22.   The quality scale was based upon experiences gained in FAO in grading compatibility of national product classifications used for agricultural statistics against international schemes. The definitions of the three statuses were taken from the 1999 paper developed by Eivind Hoffman and Mary Chamie.

23.   Discussion highlighted the need to clarify the wording to cover situations where a classification is derived from a reference classification but covered only a subset of the categories in the reference classification (different scope), and that covered the same scope but target a different domain. The ILO representative volunteered to provide wording to assist in that clarification. In addition the question was raised as to whether adding levels to a reference classification structure constituted the classification becoming a derived classification or related. It was decided to adjust the wording in the document to accommodate this as well as cover cases where classifications might have different groups at the top level, but be consistent with the reference classification at the detailed level (alternative aggregations), or where the top level categories were the same as the reference classification but the categories at the detailed level were different.

24.   Further discussion highlighted the need for good metadata and documentation around the rationale for why a classification was given a particular status. It was agreed that wording to this effect would be added to the document. Additionally it became apparent that the definition for a derived classification may require refinement and this was to be investigated.

25.   Consideration was also required of the need for an approval process mechanism for the Expert Group to actually implement and use both the Criteria for Inclusion, and Grading Criteria when endorsing or approving international statistical classifications. It was considered useful to undertake a case study to work through the documents and then formalise the process. In doing this however, consideration needed to be taken into account of whether or not there could be more than one reference classification for a particular statistical activity.

26.   The Expert Group approved the quality scale as detailed in the grading criteria document and endorsed further work on clarifying the issues as outlined above.

Composition of the International Family of Statistical Classifications

27.   UNSD presented a paper detailing work undertaken on enumerating a list of those International Statistical Classifications that could be considered for inclusion in the International Family of Statistical Classifications. The biggest issue for UNSD was the availability of resource and capacity to identify and document all those classifications to be added to the list, and in clarifying whom to contact and identify as custodians.

28.   The Expert Group noted that the list was a good starting point for discussion and for progressing work, but questions around how to prioritise or rank, whether based on status or international reporting requirements was raised as an issue. It was also noted that the Expert Group itself should be proactive in recognising and supporting classifications to be added to the Family.

29.   The issue of scope was also discussed as previously the Expert Group had indicated that only international classifications be included, not regional or national. However consideration needed to be undertaken for exceptions where there was no explicit international standard to determine if there was a suitable regional or national classification that could be used in a particular statistical domain/activity. A possibility was that if only one classification existed for a statistical activity regardless of whether it was international, regional or national, then that should be embedded into the Family until such time that the situation changed.

30.   The use of the Classification of Statistical Activities (CSA) as a means for grouping the Family was discussed. Other options proposed were an alphabetical listing, associating keywords with statistical domains or some other aspect. It was suggested that only Domains 1-3 of the CSA be used. It was felt that in the absence of anything better, and that the Family was something that would evolve over time that the CSA be used as the starting point for grouping statistical classifications included in the Family.

31.   To progress action, it was decided that Expert Group members would review the list as presented by UNSD and check for additions/deletions/changes. UNSD would get more detailed information on those already documented in the list and a priority process would be applied, in terms of most important to least, or biggest to smallest. UNSD would specifically solicit feedback or additional information from organisations/custodians (e.g. ILO, IMF).UNSD would setup a website for the Expert Group members to analyse in terms of content, functionality and search and discovery, then publish the list before applying the grading exercise. Comments were required from Expert Group members to UNSD by June 26th 2015.

Assessment of implementation of international statistical classifications in national statistical systems

32.   UNSD gave an overview presentation showing the uptake of international statistical classifications, as reported to UNSD in response to the international questionnaire. 120 countries had responded detailing 448 classifications.

33.   Expert Group members raised the issue of how to keep the information relevant with a suggestion of a five yearly cycle for updating, but also how to utilise what other agencies are doing and how to share that information.

34.   The representative from UNESCO advised that they kept information pertaining to ISCED on their website. UNESCO informed that in 2012, a Metadata survey was

undertaken to assess industry and occupation classifications available at the national level. The results of the survey were published in 2012 on their website. This survey is part of the development process of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics (UIS) Cultural Employment Statistics Survey that will be launched in July 2015. This survey will be carried out on a biennial basis. FAO also informed that a global survey (based on a UNSD questionnaire) was undertaken in 2012 to assess product classifications used for agricultural statistics at the national level. Therefore, the possibility to have in the future a joint UNSD-UNESCO-FAO questionnaire was suggested.

35.   Participation from the Pacific was raised and the representative from the Secretariat of the Pacific Community offered to do follow-up and supply information to UNSD. Obtaining information from African countries was also discussed given the lack of response from that region. Statistics South Africa offered to do further work and liaise with ECA and Afristat to obtain more information and supply this to UNSD.

36.   The scope of the questionnaire and what it should be collecting information about was raised and it was agreed that this would be discussed by the Bureau of the Expert Group to enable a way forward.

Topic 2 - Reports from Technical Sub-Groups

37.   In this topic, the Expert Group received the reports from the various technical sub-groups established at the 2013 meeting which outlined issues and proposed recommendations for the Expert Group to consider and/or approve.

International Standard Industrial Classification of All Economic Activities (ISIC), Rev 4

38.   UNSD gave an overview presentation of the work of the Technical Sub-Group ISIC (TSG-ISIC) including the resolution of known issues that were resolved at the face-to-face meeting of the TSG-ISIC in New York in October 2014. The key issue for discussion at the October 2014 meeting was the treatment of factoryless goods producers (FGPs) and progress on this was reported to the Expert Group meeting. In addition the need for an update or revision to ISIC, and when that would be advisable was discussed.

39.   The session included via video-conference representatives from the Task Force on Global Production and participation from Mr. Herman Smith of UNSD.

40.   With regards to the issue of FGPs as raised by the Task Force on Global Production and the Advisory Expert Group on National Accounts, the TSG-ISIC recommended that no structural changes be made to ISIC for now and that the status quo remain for existing guidelines in relation to outsourcing. It was also recommended that additional research be undertaken to fully understand the nature, composition and importance of the activity of outsourcing in the factoryless production of goods. There was also a need to consider the

consequence of any potential changes to the current ISIC treatments in all relevant statistical domains. A practical outcome and typology was needed. National statistical offices were encouraged to flag integrated manufacturers, manufacturing contractors and FGPs in their survey programs or business registers to facilitate data analysis and future resolution on their placement within ISIC.

41.   It was noted that potential future changes to the definition of manufacturing may be required and the associated impact this would have for deciding on whether to revise ISIC or not. Issues raised that would need clarification included: What would be the effect on other industries, what criteria for defining activities should be used, was there a need to consider assets on the classification decisions and was there a need for explicit treatment for captive units?

42.   The Expert Group agreed to the recommendations of the TSG-ISIC to retain the status quo in ISIC and for further research to be undertaken on FGPs. Expert Group members were encouraged to investigate the situation in their respective countries and report back to the TSG-ISIC.

43.   A critical issue however was understanding the concept of what constitutes factoryless goods production as both respondents and statisticians did not consistently describe the composition, make-up or scope of the concept, causing confusion.

44.   It was agreed that a broad framework of a typology be created (as recommended by the TSG-ISIC) by the end of 2015 and that the existing TSG-ISIC was mandated to continue its work with the Bureau to revise and update the Terms of Reference to recognise the change in work to be progressed. Statistics Austria was to be added to the TSG-ISIC.

Additional ISIC-related presentations and discussion

45.   A number of presentations and additional papers in relation to ISIC were presented.

(a) Appropriateness of retail sales distinguished by sales channels

46.   Elmer Wein from the Federal Statistical Office of Germany gave a PowerPoint presentation on the use of ISIC in measuring activities in relation to multichannel retail sales brought about by the increased use of the Internet. An issue that resulted from the shifting of principal activities from retail sales in stores to retail sales via Internet is the apparent disappearance of stores. However there was a proposal for a future breakdown in retail sales which included abandoning the breakdown according to the sales channel within the classification; keeping the differentiation between specialised and non-specialised retail sales; and keeping a further subdivision according to the range of products sold.

47.   Whilst there was some support in the US, it was noted that the use of margin price indexes enabled creation of two separate survey units, one for store components and one for

the mail order side of things. However there was an issue of how to still identify this difference without leaving it to the survey.

48.   Eurostat advised about work that had been done on this by a Eurostat working group which included a proposal to increase the detail in retail sales via mail order houses or via the Internet by groups of products. The ILO representative felt that it would be preferable to retain Internet mail order retail as a separate category, as many of the characteristics of retail establishments without shops, including the employment characteristics, were quite different from those with shops.

49.   Morocco outlined its views on the need for an ISIC revision at this point of proceedings thus negating a separate presentation later in the session (as noted in the agenda). It also recognised that it was more and more difficult to separate the turnover of products and that there may be need for the creation of a new division.

50.   It was decided to refer this matter to the TSG-ISIC for further work.

(b) Classification of Holding Companies according to NACE

51.   Ms. Ana Franco from Eurostat gave a presentation of work being done on holding companies and head offices for the information of the Expert Group. It was noted that ISIC explanatory notes should be consistent with the national accounts perspective.

(c) Brazilian remarks on the need for a revision or update of ISIC Rev 4

52.   Mr. Samuel Santos from Brazil gave an overview of the situation and processes used in developing and approving classifications for use. Differences between ISIC and the Brazilian industrial classification were noted. With regards to issues relating to the classification of agricultural activities (as noted in the paper ESA/STAT/AC.289/7) FAO offered to collaborate to provide advice and a resolution.

53.   The paper on the Use of ISIC for non-statistical purposes – national experiences was not presented due to the absence of Matthias Greulich. Expert Group members were reminded to read and comment on the paper.

(d) Whether to review ISIC or not?

54.   It was agreed that there was no need to review ISIC Rev 4 in the immediate future. It was agreed to keep the issue on the agenda for the Expert Group meeting and see if there was a tipping point that would justify a review when the next meeting takes place in 2017. The TSG-ISIC would report back on the work being undertaken regarding the treatment of FGPs as this was deemed to be the only potential issue that may trigger a future review.

Classification of Individual Consumption According to Purpose (COICOP)

55.   The report of the Technical Sub-Group for COICOP (TSG-COICOP) was presented to the meeting. The report highlighted the work done in resolving known issues in relation to COICOP through the use of case law determinations. Members of the Expert Group sought clarification on a few of the resolved issues and this was referred back to the TSG-COICOP for action. The TSG-COICOP was given one month to comment on the issues requiring clarity and then formalise the outcomes to enable addition to the UNSD website.

56.   The main question for consideration by the Expert Group was whether or not there was a need to review COICOP? Many members were in favour of a review taking place, particularly given the feedback received from respondents to the global questionnaire. The issue that was then discussed was about who had responsibility for instigating a formal review i.e. was it the Expert Group or the Intersecretariat Working Group for the System of National Accounts (IWGSNA). It was decided that the Expert Group would inform the IWGSNA that a review was required and would initiate a formal review process. With this in mind it was agreed to continue with the current composition of the TSG-COICOP and membership was reaffirmed with those members present.

57.   The additional issue of the flow-on effect from reviewing COICOP for the other classifications contained in the System of National Accounts (SNA) was discussed. It was agreed that any consideration for this should wait until COICOP itself was reviewed.

58.   Recognising that confirmation of a review required IWGSNA agreement and involvement it was considered that a first draft of a revised COICOP be presented to the 2017 meeting of the UN Expert Group on International Statistical Classifications, along with visibility to the appropriate meeting of the UN Statistical Commission.

Central Product Classification (CPC)

59.   UNSD gave a presentation on the work undertaken since the last Expert Group meeting by the Technical Sub-Group for CPC. In finalising CPC a number of issues had been encountered particularly in the area of energy related products which had delayed completion of the classification. The TSG-CPC had looked at 43 issues requiring conceptual discussion, 15 issues of clarification and 22 issues that were regarded as straightforward. 9 issues remained unresolved and these were mostly related to the Standard International Energy Product Classification (SIEC).

60.   A final review of the explanatory notes, a manual cross-check of exclusion and inclusion text, and a review of the correspondence tables was required to enable final publication of CPC V2.1. A definitive final publication date was not available.

Additional CPC related presentations and discussion

61.   A number of presentations and additional papers in relation to CPC were presented.

(a) CPC implementation and other activities on classifications in FAO

62.   Ms. Valentina Ramaschiello of FAO presented activities undertaken on CPC and other classifications since the 2013 Expert Group meeting. FAO had made significant contribution and proposals to expand the agricultural component of CPC and to produce an official annex to the classification.

63.   FAOSTAT had implemented the replacement of the old classification for agricultural commodities (crops, livestock and their derived products) with CPC Ver 2.1 expanded for agricultural statistics, which is now published on the FAO website. The annual FAO agricultural production questionnaire was circulated using CPC for the first time in 2014 and a new statistical working system using CPC is under development.

64.   A significant improvement in the measurement and classification of fishery products and statistics had been introduced in CPC Ver 2.1 but a lot of work was still required to fine-tune and test CPC as an alternative aggregation in FishSTAT. Further work includes developing an expansion of fishery and forest products and the long-term development of explanatory notes. The alignment of CPC to HS remains a critical task for FAO.

65.   FAO has also undertaken work on developing guidelines on international classifications for agricultural statistics which have been reviewed by members of the Expert Group and UNSD. Implementing the Land Use classification within SEEA has also been undertaken, and the FAO corporate statistical programme of work has been grouped by the Classification of Statistical Activities with the addition of a new domain for Food Security.

(b) New issues requiring guidance in the use of the CPC

66.   This paper was put forward by the World Trade Organisation in terms of seeking clarification on the measurement of services using CPC. WTO has been using the CPC Provisional, but issues have been encountered in applying the Provisional CPC to some newly observed services. The matter was referred to the TSG-CPC to resolve and provide advice.

(c) International Trade in ICT Services and ICT-Enabled Services

67.   This paper described a broadening of the concept of ICT-related services. While the CPC already includes an alternative aggregation for services of the information economy (including ICT services), further review is necessary to ascertain how the paper provided relates to these concepts. The matter was referred to the TSG-CPC to resolve and provide advice.

Topic 3 - Review of new classifications developments and/or revisions

Broad Economic Categories

68.   An overview presentation of work undertaken in the review of the Classification of Broad Economic Categories and a report back from the Technical Sub-Group for Broad Economic Categories was presented by Mr. Ronald Janssen of UNSD.

69.   A history of the development of BEC and its relationship to the Standard International Trade Classification (SITC) was explained. There had been a growing need for international trade statistics to be analysed by broad economic categories and then in relation to classes already in the SITC. Fundamentally this treatment had not changed over time.

70.   In 2011 a technical sub-group was set to redefine BEC to better reflect current economic reality, and to extend its scope to include services, to improve the explanatory materials and provide an updated correspondence. As a result, a revision was instigated which sought to determine whether BEC was still relevant, whether end-use categories should be more visible, whether better guidance on a dual-use classification was feasible along with a need to update economic categories and links to national account supply-use table usage. Services were to be added to facilitate the BEC-CPC linkage and a review of the HS-BEC correspondences was required. The draft new manual gives definitions of structure and guidance on the correspondences, and /or end-use to enable countries to understand and establish a reflection of their own economies.

71.   The dimensions to be included in the new classification were:
- broad economic categories,
- goods and services,
- end-use categories,
- primary and processed generic goods, and
- durable and non-durable goods.

72.   Global consultation took place during July-September 2014 with 49 responses out of 198 received. From the consultation there was general agreement to the process that had been undertaken and the outcomes proposed for the direction of the classification.

73.   It was proposed that an updated draft manual be circulated within the TSG-BEC for finalisation, before sending to the full Expert Group for review and endorsement. The classification would then be presented to the UN Statistical Commission for approval.

74.   The Expert Group had no further comments with regard to the outcome of the global consultation and endorsed the proposed next steps as outlined above.

Business Functions

75.   A proposal to develop a Business Functions classification had been brought to the 2011 meeting of the UN Expert Group on International Statistical Classifications, and a technical sub-group had been set up. However little, if any, work had been progressed on this topic, and as a result the planned progress report to the Bureau had not been developed.

76.   The idea for a Business Functions classification originated from work done in Europe where they did a survey in 2007 of 7 EU states looking at outsourcing of firms within the context of globalisation. The idea of a standard classification was a proposed outcome of that work. A critical issue for the Expert Group was the lack of clarity of what was the definition of the concept of Business Functions to understand whether a classification was the right approach.

77.   It was decided that the TSG-BF, as set up at the 2013 Expert Group meeting, remain with the addition of the representative from Canada, and that the TSG-BF be tasked with clarifying the concept and investigating whether, as a result, a statistical classification was needed. UNSD Trade were to provide appropriate information to the TSG-BF to enable it to make a recommendation on a way forward to the Expert Group.

EBOPS-CPC Correspondence

78.   A short discussion took place on where the work on this stands. Not much progress had been made (only Canada and UNSD provided responses) and the TSG-CPC was tasked with reviewing the correspondence and reporting back to the Bureau.

Integration of Statistical and Geospatial Information, Frameworks and Standards

79.   Mr. Greg Scott, on behalf of the United Nations Expert Group on Global Geospatial Information Management (UN-GGIM), briefed the Expert Group on what GGIM is and what it does, and on the data and classifications that go with data in a geospatial versus statistical context. The role of the Intergovernmental UN Committee of Experts was explained in terms of their role in setting the global agenda on geospatial to enable development of effective strategies to build geospatial capacity in developing countries, address global issues and contribute to collective knowledge as a community with shared interests and concerns.

80.   There was a clear need for a global mechanism as there was a significant gap in the recognition and management of geospatial information globally, and a lack of a global consultative and decision-making mechanism.

81.   The impact of and on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) was discussed as the SDGs are underpinned by data on location and/or place, although geospatial doesn't easily tie into indicators or policy. It fundamentally comes down to data underpinned by good classifications and standards, but it is not necessarily being done as all the data around

addresses, titles etc. can be used in different ways (in relation to policy such as carbon emissions, land cover, biodiversity etc.).

82.   The example of land use and land cover was given as they were similar but different, and there was a need to look at rates of change, and at what level i.e. regional or national. An integrated classification to measure over space and time, consistently and authoritatively would be beneficial.

83.   Statistical geospatial framework – could it be applied to a global perspective and then use that as a possible process in the 2020 round of censuses? A key objective for the GGIM is to create a statistical framework that was scalable, which had a number of factors such as a geocode or identifier at the detailed level, but which also addressed privacy concerns and utilised metadata standards, and was clear about what boundaries to use.

84.   Work was also being done in relation to ISO/TC 211 for geographic standards and metadata but many users and decision makers were not aware of the standards and were building their own from scratch. Creating a user guide to assist users in understanding the need for standards to inform policy makers and program managers was seen as important, especially in helping everyone to better understand what standards to use, when and why. This is an issue that is faced by most statistical classifications.

85.   Expert Group members commented on the issue of open source maps and the issues of accuracy that these raise, and it was suggested that tools such as Google Maps be treated as a complementary tool rather than a single approach. It was also noted that there were a lot of entities and elements within the geospatial work that aligned neatly with GSIM and information on GSIM was to be forwarded to the GGIM.

86.   FAO indicated the Land Cover classification in SEEA as an example of integration with geospatial standards (and notably with the FAO Land Cover Classification System – LCCS), and asked the extent to which GGIM had used or referred to this scheme. GGIM had been working with SEEA and was intending to have a workshop later in 2015 around this.

87.   It was agreed that the GGIM and the Expert Group on International Statistical Classifications should work more collaboratively, and keep each other informed of work, and a mechanism to achieve this was to be established, initially through formal contact.

Harmonised Commodity Description and Coding System (HS)

88.   Mr. Tom Beris from the World Customs Organisation (WCO) gave a presentation on the HS 2017 review and its implications. There were acknowledgements from, and to, the Secretary of the Harmonised System Committee, and the Secretary-General of the WCO.

89.   The status of HS 2017 was that in June 2014 the proposed amendments had been accepted by the council and WCO was now in a two and a half year transition process to implement and finalise the changes. There were 233 sets of amendments for 2017 including

85 in agriculture, 45 maintenance/chemical, 13 wood, 15 textile, 6 metals, 35 machinery, 8 transport and 26 various other amendments. In addition a lot of work had been done in cooperation with UN and FAO.

90.   In the transition period there are certain obligations to fulfil. These are:

- creating correlation tables with HS 2012,
- completing unilingual and bilingual nomenclature (English and French),
- updating the compendium of classification opinions,
- enabling the brochure on amendments in HS 2017 to be made available in Jan 2016 containing a comprehensive list of changes,
- updating the online commodity database,
- updating of the laboratory guide and classification handbook,
- correlations with other main international conventions to be created, and
- updating of modules for training purposes.

91.   WCO has begun the HS2022 development and was requesting suggestions from member countries, on scope, headings and sub-headings for the review. The question was raised as to how national statistical offices could influence this process, as changes to the HS are primarily advised by national customs agencies. WCO were open to a direct approach or via UNSD, although they were still preferring countries going through their national bodies. It was agreed that a formal and direct approach be made by the Expert Group to the WCO Secretariat to open a line of dialogue and establish an ongoing relationship between the two groups.

(a) FAO Contributions to the Harmonised System (HS)

92.   FAO informed the Expert Group of the changes put forward for the 2017 HS review in relation to agriculture, forestry and fisheries. FAO had been closely collaborating with WCO and had proposed 168 HS changes. The proposals were accompanied by a rationale, data about the product, definitions of the products, and where available, photographs of the products to assist customs officers identify them at border controls. This approach was recommended as a way for national statistical offices and national bodies to communicate proposals for change i.e. the more information supplied to the WCO the better. Proposals should be submitted to the WCO about six years before the entrance into force of the next HS version. As of today, the vast majority of the FAO proposals are approved and included in the HS2017 new structure.

93.   The question was raised as to whether national HS information including category definitions was available from the WCO. It was advised that member countries were encouraged to provide a link to their websites although there was not universal adoption of this practice. Information was then able to be viewed under the 'Nomenclature' tab on the WCO website.

94.   There was some discussion on product linkages and the difficulties encountered, especially by UNSD in establishing the cross-classification linkages.

(b) Impact of Interpretations in Product Classifications on ISIC, CPC-HS linkages and Consistency

95.   UNSD made a presentation outlining the impacts of changes resulting from HS update. The HS is a reference classification for the classification of goods and is a building block for the CPC, especially as CPC uses HS definitions. Consequently any interpretations or rulings in the HS have a significant impact. The project with the FAO developing explanatory notes may alleviate some of the problems that this poses, but this is a long term process and has its own set of shortcomings.

96.   Additionally, the classification of an item in the CPC will often be used to identify its manufacturing class in ISIC. HS interpretations may also impact on interpretations within ISIC. While there is no strict rule it is a method often used in practice. But following strict links from the HS poses problems as HS rulings are based on criteria that are not always consistent with ISIC criteria. So the questions raised are around how to avoid differences in interpretation amongst different classifications (in particular wrong ISIC interpretations based on using industry-product links) and is there a viable process for resolution. To what degree can any contradictions be accepted as countries need guidance that can be implemented without major problems?

97.   It was decided that these questions be circulated to the Expert Group for formal response and guidance to UNSD.

19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians

98.   Mr. David Hunter from the ILO presented the outcomes of the 19th International Conference of Labour Statisticians on statistical classifications and resolutions to put the rest of the Expert Group discussion on ISCO and ISCE into context.

99.   The 19th ICLS updated the international standards for statistics of the economically active population, employment and unemployment, through the adopting of a resolution concerning statistics of work, employment and labour underutilisation. This resolution establishes the first comprehensive framework for statistics on all forms of work. The changes move the boundary between employment and other forms of work with consequences for the content and/or scope of a number of international classifications such as ISCO, ISCE and ICATUS.

100.   Key features of the resolution of relevance to work on international classifications were:

   a) a reference concept of work and associated conceptual framework for forms of work, operational definitions and guidelines for each form of work
   b) a set of new indicators of labour underutilisation, in addition to the unemployment rate;

c) the impact on statistical classifications in particular the reference concept of work and its definitions, and the refinement of the definition of the statistical unit of job;

d) the definition of work is consistent with the SNA08 productive activities which enables coherence between work statistics and economic statistics. Definitions are aligned with the general production boundary and cover work performed in any kind of economic unit.

e) five mutually exclusive forms of work are defined: own-use production work (goods and services for own final use), employment (work performed for others in exchange for pay or profit), unpaid trainees work (for others without pay to acquire work place experience or skills), volunteer (non-compulsory work performed for other work (mainly compulsory unpaid work) – all comprise the concept of work;

f) employment is restricted to activities to produce goods and services for remuneration (i.e. pay or profit) and thus excludes some activities previously counted as employment (own-use production of goods, some volunteer work and some unpaid trainee work). The definition of job is updated to be 'a set of tasks and duties performed, or meant to be performed, by one person for a single economic unit'. (The term job is used only with reference to employment);

g) this statistical unit, when relating to own-use production work, trainee work and volunteer work is referred to as 'work activity';

h) the need to update the definition of occupation when ISCO is next reviewed as 'a set of *jobs or work activities* whose main tasks and duties are characterised by a high degree of similarity in order to make it clear that the classification of occupations can apply to all forms of work.

International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08)

101. Mr. Hunter gave overview on the background to the adoption of ISCO08 including work being undertaken by the ILO to support implementation. There is a planned manual on adapting ISCO for national and regional use being developed, but no resources are currently available to complete that work. Spanish and French versions were being finalised and it is hoped to publish this year. Saudi Arabia has done a translation into Arabic and this can be provided to Expert Group members if wanted before being finally published. An index of occupational titles is also being developed.

102. The ILO provides training on a regional or sub-regional basis subject to resource availability, along with technical assistance.

103. The 19th ICLS discussed the need to update ISCO08 as per the 2013 recommendation of the UN Expert Group on International Statistical Classifications.

104. There are a number of issues that can only be resolved through a full review particularly the application of skill level as a classification criterion, the breadth of skill level 2, and the boundary between skill level 2 and skill level 3 which affects technicians and craft occupations.

105. There are some issues that could be addressed in a minor update such as the separate identification and revised treatment of a number of occupation such as the health

occupations, and the provision of a category for operators of small hospitality establishment.

106.   Some experts believed a short-term update should be a priority, others believed that an update would be premature at this stage as ISCO08 is not fully implemented as yet. The ICLS was also concerned that a major revision should fit in with the 2020 census cycle and that if a review was begun after the next ICLS in 2018, it may not be possible for all countries to implement a new classification until 2030. The ICLS had therefore suggested that a more thoroughly developed set of options for the revision of ISCO-08 be presented to the 20th ICLS.

107.   It was better not to do a minor update, as the impact of skill level issues really needs to be addressed as part of a full review. However ILO has limited resources at present and the priority is in developing and finalising the International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE).

108.   It was noted that the issues around skill level discussed in the ILO paper were becoming problematic, and that several countries would be undertaking revision work on their national classifications in the coming few years. This work could potentially feed into the ILO's proposals for a revision.

109.   It was decided that the Expert Group would recommend that a technical working group be established to assist the ILO to determine an approach for the revision of ISCO and support the ILO with the work. The Expert Group asked to be informed on progress at its next meeting.

International Classification of Status in Employment (ICSE)

110.   Mr. Hunter presented an overview of what was in scope and not in scope for the ICSE review based on the direction and outcomes of the 19th ICLS. He also covered the main uses of statistics classified according to status in employment.

111.   The reasons for revision were inclusive of categories not providing sufficient information to adequately monitor changes on employment arrangements and not enough detail to monitor various non-standard forms of employment.

112.   Since the concept of employment had been restricted by the 19th ICLS to work for payment or profit, and the one to one relationship between employment and the SNA production boundary was no longer maintained, some ICSE-93 categories were no longer included in employment. Information about workers in the various forms of work were nevertheless required for a variety of purposes, including the provision of data on labour inputs to the national accounts.

113.   Issues being addressed in the review included:
*   overall conceptual framework for comparable statistics on various aspects of the relationship between worker and the economic unit in which they work;
*   the scope of the review and the new classification;

- relevance of a distinction between paid employment and self-employment;
- which concepts are to be included in a new central classification of status, and which should be identified as separate classifications.
- boundary between self-employment and paid employment;
- identification of workers with various types of employment arrangement that might indicate precarious employment situations, such as casual, short term and seasonal workers plus workers on zero contracts

114.   An overview of the revision process was given which highlighted the proposal to replace the existing classification with a suite of standards for statistics on the work relationship.

115.   A working group to support the ILO had been established which was relatively informal, and an online discussion forum was being set up. The role of the working group was to provide expert advice to the group, and to assist with the development and testing of proposals.

116.   A number of issues had been identified by the working group including the need to retain a status of employment classification that was restricted to employment as currently defined. There was also a need to retain a dichotomy between paid employment and self-employment but there were some limitations around that.

117.   An option was to create a classification of status based on the type of authority/dependency proposed divided between independent workers and dependent workers, and to create a classification of status based on the type of economic risk split into workers in employment for profit and workers in paid employment. Each classification would use the same set of detailed categories as building blocks but use different criteria to organise them into broad categories/

118.   The working group had come up with a matrix framework as a starting point in developing a classification and conceptual model for statistics on status at work. A number of complementary variables were currently proposed.

119.   An overview of the timelines for the revision of ICSE-93 was presented which noted that field testing would take place next year (2016) and that a first draft resolution for the 20th ICLS would be prepared, then using 2017 to redraft and do further testing if required. A finalised draft resolution and papers would be created in 2018 to enable presentation at the 20th ICLS. The draft resolution would need to be reviewed by at least one formal tripartite Meeting of Experts in Labour Statistics in advance of the ICLS.

120.   It was agreed that the Expert Group needed to be more fully involved with the working group on ICSE. The Bureau would discuss potential direct Expert Group involvement in the working group. The Expert Group asked that a draft resolution be made available for Expert Group comment and discussion at its 2017 meeting.

International Classification of Activities for Time-Use Statistics (ICATUS)

121.   UNSD gave a presentation on what has been happening on ICATUS. ICATUS provides a dissemination framework for international comparability of national time use statistics. It is relevant and useful for both developed and developing countries.

122.   The original classification was issued as a trial international classification in 2005 and since then several countries have adapted it for their use, and UNSD has received comments on its suitability along with suggestions for terminology changes in the classification. The desire is to have an international standard endorsed by the Statistical Commission.

123.   It has taken 20 years to try and get to an approved international standard. The 2012 ICATUS Expert Group meeting developed a draft classification which then required input from the ILO to accommodate definitional changes brought about by the outcomes of the 19th ICLS. The basic framework used has been SNA focussed with the first 8 broad groups part of the SNA production boundary and the other 7 for the household. It provides an aggregated view of SNA.

124.   The next steps for ICATUS was to prepare a final draft of ICATUS ensuring consistency with other classifications, verifying with experts and the ICATUS EGM at end of the year, and then seeking any adjustments from experts before taking to the 2017 Statistical Commission for endorsement. It was noted that the ILO and UNSD are close to agreement on work coverage categories and structure within ICATUS. The process for finalising the classification would involve a virtual consultation along with a physical meeting of the ICATUS Expert Group.

125.   It was decided that there was no need to establish a technical sub-group for ICATUS as discussed at the 2013 meeting but that David Hunter (ILO) and Andrew Hancock (Statistics New Zealand) would continue to represent the Expert Group on International Statistical Classifications on the review of ICATUS.

International Classification for Crime Statistics (ICCS)

126.   Mr. Enrico Bisogno from the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) gave an overview of the development of the International Classification for Crime Statistics (ICCS) which was endorsed by the UN Statistical Commission at its meeting in 2015. The key issues for discussion with the Expert Group focussed around the dissemination and implementation of ICCS, and in how to include ICCS in the International Family of Statistical Classifications.

127.   ICCS has been translated into the official languages of the United Nations but dissemination itself is somewhat hampered by resourcing issues within UNODC. An implementation manual was being developed comprising four parts – a mapping for national statistical agencies to enable comparison with ICCS, the mapping of crime victimisation surveys, counting rules and coding (ICCS codebook). Technical support was dependent on funding so an initial approach has been to get some information accessible on

the UNODC website to help countries understand and implement ICCS. There was to be meeting of the ICCS Expert Group in June to discuss the implementation guide, crime victimisation surveys and also to undertake an assessment of national positions in relation to implementing ICCS. A technical advisory group was proposed.

128. The question was raised as to how to make ICCS part of the International Family of Statistical Classifications and it may be a case study for the new criteria and grading process established by the Expert Group.

129. Members of the Expert Group gave their comments and advice on implementation exercises that they had undertaken, particularly around the use of discussion forums, regional collaboration and how to map national classifications to the ICCS. Concern was expressed that development of a manual or methodological volumes may be a bit challenging for some countries. The Philippines offered to be a case study for the implementation process of ICCS to give a national experience. However the challenge was in attempts to persuade countries to change their national classifications and how UNODC could actively help, which may lead to changes in the documentation and a move away from the focus on mapping guidelines.

130. UNODC would send a link to Expert Group members and make hardcopy available for those that wanted it.

Big Data

131. Mr. Ronald Janssen from the Trade Statistics Branch of UNSD gave an overview on Big Data and Official Statistics – there is a website on this topic maintained by UNSD at http://unstats.un.org/unsd/trade/bigdata/

132. What is big data for official statistics? It is basically high volume, velocity and variety of data. A global working group is looking at mobile phone data mainly used for tourism statistics but also supermarket scanner for price statistics; vehicle tracking devices for transport statistics; twitter for consumer confidence statistics and satellite imagery for agriculture statistics. The global working group was set up with 8 task teams. The issue of SDG indicators was important in terms of where and how they can be met. There were also skills, capacity and cross–cutting issues which were forming work being undertaken by the Global Working Group.

133. The challenges were the methodology (the need for representativeness, volatility, standardisation and modelling), privacy, IT infrastructure, human skills, and partnerships for national statistical offices with big data providers as well as private research institutes and academic institutions as they will have a lot more modelling than traditional sources.

134. A classification of Types of Big Data had been developed by UNECE in the first instance. It was questioned whether there was really a need for such a classification. Another question raised was that when collecting social media data how often do you need to change given the uptake of new media and change or overtaking of existing media?

135. A global survey is underway and has a broad definition which covers three parts – office management, current status of Big Data projects, and guidelines on big data in official statistics.

136. It was noted that classifications are everywhere and essential within and throughout big data, and this will raise challenges especially for new classification development and maintenance of existing classifications. It was also important to be aware that it is difficult to control and that influencing decisions around it was an appropriate approach. The introduction of machine-learning and the use of process or social media were emerging phenomena affecting how to deal with big data.

137. Taxonomy work in relation to the development and/or use of a classification of Types of Big Data needed to involve the Expert Group and it was agreed that UNSD would invite the Expert Group to assist.

Progress on Adoption and Regionalisation of International Classifications in the Pacific

138. Ms. Nilima Lal from the Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC) discussed the issues of harmonising statistical standards across the Pacific region. There were 22 member countries with most having small statistical agencies. Often there was low awareness that an international classification existed, that there was difficulties in identifying the correct categories for products, and there was a lack of understanding of classification theory and principles.

139. SPC had decided to regionalise some reference classifications, in particular ISIC and COICOP which now had Pacific versions. The Pacific Standard Industrial Classification (PACSIC 2014) had also embedded the ISCED11 developments along with supplementary information for informal activities.

140. An overview of a recent classifications workshop held in Fiji was discussed including the future work programme for the region. There was demand for a regionalised Harmonised System classification as well as a regional occupation classification. For the occupation classification. ILO, Statistics New Zealand and the Australian Bureau of Statistics were to collaborate with SPC. For the HS, SPC has requested Oceania Customs Organisations collaboration.

141. The FAO requested clarification of the use of CPC in the region and offered its support to the SPC.

ECLAC Working Group on International Classifications (GTCI)

142. Ms. Eva Castillo from Mexico's Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía informed that this Working Group had been set up in 2010 to support countries of the Latin American and Caribbean region in adopting or adapting new versions of the international

classifications with support from UNSD, UNESCO and ILO. A face-to-face meeting had taken place in August 2014 to note the progress in the implementation and adoption of ISIC, CPC and ISCO.

143.   An electronic forum is maintained to keep member states informed of international changes and to enable sharing of experiences. Spanish translations of key documents such as the ISIC Implementation Guide are underway. Training on classifications such as ISIC and CPC took place along with wider collaboration, communication and coordination with organisations that had helped with or developed the regional classifications.

Homelessness in New Zealand

144.   Mr. Andrew Hancock from Statistics New Zealand presented work being done on developing a standard definition and classification for the measurement of homeless in official statistics in New Zealand.

145.   Work had begun in 2009 when the first definition was developed in response to calls from local and central government, as well as agencies providing emergency accommodation and temporary housing needs. Statistics New Zealand had led the development of the definition in collaboration with an across-government working group.

146.   The definition was developed in consultation with non-government housing providers, community groups, Māori stakeholders, and government agencies. Definitions from other countries were evaluated but the working group elected to base the New Zealand definition on the European Observatory on Homelessness (ETHOS) definition which had a conceptual model based on three domains: the physical domain, the legal domain and the social domain.

147.   Initial investigations into the use of the standard definition indicate that organisations have adopted the definition and draft classification for collection and reporting purposes. Several non-government organisations have implemented the definition as it meets existing needs and gives weight to statistics for funders.

148.   Issues identified were that some organisations have yet to change over to the definition, that a training course for coding the definition was required, and that there was a need for guidelines for recording transitions among homeless categories.

149.   The next steps were to refine the definition and the draft classification, survey organisations to identify issues that need to be addressed, develop training courses for the definition and guidelines for recording and classifying transitions, and recognise that there was perhaps a need to review the statistical standard for occupied dwelling type.

150.   The Expert Group was encouraged to provide feedback or comment directly to Statistics New Zealand.

Gender Identity – Developing a Statistical Standard

151.   Mr. Andrew Hancock from Statistics New Zealand presented work being done on developing a standard definition and classification for the measurement of gender identity in New Zealand.

152.   The development of a statistical standard includes a standardised approach for collecting and producing gender identity information to be used across the New Zealand Official Statistical System.

153.   The purpose of this work is to:

- standardise definitions and measures of gender identity to improve accessibility, interpretability, and comparability of data and reduce duplication of effort
- enable policy-makers to develop measures to adequately address the health and social needs of these populations
- meet human rights requirements for data collection
- ensure respondents have the same experience when providing information.

154.   Statistics New Zealand had led the development of the definition in collaboration with an across-government working group.

155.   Gender identity is defined as an individual's internal sense of being wholly female, wholly male, or having aspects of female and/or male. A two level classification has been developed supported by a comprehensive glossary of terms to support identification of different categories of gender identity.

156.   The concept has primarily been developed for administrative agencies and collections, with a view to future adoption in statistical surveys, such as the five yearly Census of Population and Dwellings. A primary challenge has been in developing a suitable question module that can be utilised across collections.

157.   The Expert Group was encouraged to provide feedback or comment directly to Statistics New Zealand.

Topic 4 – Metadata standards

The Global Inventory of Statistical Standards

158.   Ms. Sabine Warschburger from UNSD provided a background overview of how the Global Inventory for Statistical Standard was developed and of its mandate under the Committee for Coordination of Statistical Activities (CCSA).

159.   The inventory provides information on known statistical standards which are described via general content. http://unstats.un.org/unsd/iiss/

160. There is currently no particular governance structure in place for the inventory so whilst UNSD can provide logistical support there is a need for a governance process. The inventory also has to be multilingual (work currently in progress to achieve this) and there is the issue of visibility and where to place it on the UNSD website.

161. A number of questions were raised by Expert Group members including:

- Does the Expert Group need to be involved in the governance structure?
- Is there or should there be alignment with the international family of statistical classifications?
- What is the scope of the inventory and what is a standard?
- Is there a need for the Expert Group to work with the UNECE HLG Modernisation Committee on Standards on this?
- How is the content defined?
- Who should have ownership?

162. It was agreed that the Expert Group work with the HLG Modernisation Committee on Standards and as Ms. Alice Born of Statistics Canada was on both groups, she was delegated as the Expert Group liaison with the modernisation committee and UNSD.

163. It was suggested that UNSD take ownership and follow up with agencies on an annual basis but the issue of governance was a critical issue requiring resolution.

Generic Statistical Information Model (GSIM) and the Metadata Standards for Statistical Classifications

164. Ms. Alice Born from Statistics Canada, on behalf of the Modernisation Committee on Standards, gave an overview presentation and background information on GSIM and in particular the GSIM Statistical Classification Model (which was based on the Neuchatel Terminology Model). The alignment of entities and concepts within the information model and the influence of Neuchatel was discussed. It was noted that GSIM was not a model that could be adopted as a single entity or operationalised as such. Countries were to use the relevant parts for their own needs but adapt to national needs on a consistent basis. This would ensure feasibility of application also in statistical systems in developing countries or for those under resource constraints.

165. In addition an overview was presented of the SDMX Global Registry and work being done on standardising codelists for use within SDMX. It was noted by UNESCO that they had adopted SDMX for surveys in all areas of work: education, culture, science and communication. They are currently developing the questionnaire on cultural employment using ISCO08 and ISCI Rev 4. But there was an issue with the data structure definitions (DSDs) as these needed to be consistent with the known classification codes and the classifications themselves. It was felt that there needed to be liaison with the SDMX Statistical Working Group and SDMX Secretariat on their work given its relationship to classifications.

166.   An issue raised was the naming convention for codelists and that a clear process be adopted, particularly in relation to the ability of search engines to mine codelists. It was also noted that the proliferation of codelists was a problem as the relationships between associated classifications and codelists was not ideal. There was a risk of proliferation of use-specific and non-standard codelists. Switzerland noted that they have a centralised SDMX classification system linked to their Business Register, which works very well. As a member of the SDMX Statistical Working Group, Canada will provide the feedback from the Expert Group.

167.   It was noted that the HLG had set up a discussion forum and a link was to be provided for the Expert Group to provide information on experiences with GSIM to assist countries trying to operationalise and implement GSIM.

New Zealand Classification Management System (Ariā)

168.   Andrew Hancock from Statistics New Zealand provided an update on progress made since the last Expert Group meeting on Ariā which is their new Classification Management system. A live access to the Ariā user interface was used to showcase the tool and underpin the fact that Ariā supports a change in philosophy in statistical classification development and maintenance.

169.   Development of Ariā had continued with Metadata Technology North America (MTNA) to a point that Statistics New Zealand had recently deployed a first release of the system into their production environment. Eventually the use of cloud technology will enable all users of the New Zealand Official Statistical System to access and use Ariā. At the moment an across government initiative for authorised user authentication had to be put in place.

170.   Ariā uses the best parts of known metadata standards such as Neuchatel, SDMX, ISO 11179, GSIM, supported by RDF and SKOS. It is not reliant on, nor based upon a single standard to reduce redesign issues that could occur. The system is modular and flexible and customisable.

171.   Ariā uses concepts as the basis for building classifications and in particular uses category sets (similar to SDMX codelists) to scope the content of a concept. Users can then cut and dice the category set to create their own views (or classifications) of approved content. Users were forced to use existing content unless they could justify otherwise. All content was interrelated to show the linkages across concepts and categories to enable easy identification of source or reference classifications. This approach also facilitated automated building of correspondence (concordance) tables.

172.   Single stand-alone classifications put into a cyclical review program were no longer the norm, as Ariā enabled dynamic updating of content to reflect real-world needs, and as everything is time-stamped, users can choose when to adopt new content.

173.   Ariā also contains statistical standards which provide the metadata around the concept, definitions, questionnaire module and outputs to be used. The system is integrated

via a Metadata Access Layer to other metadata systems such as the Business Register, Geospatial Management System and the survey information repository. This approach meant that a user could access one system and view information from any combination of the others to get a more informed, richer picture of information. Using a metadata access layer also enabled component parts to be replaced without the need for reintegration or redesign of other systems. Ariā also supports coding tools and stores the text that comprises the coding indexes and has a bilingual component to enable New Zealand content to be presented in both English and Māori.

Other Classifications

174.   Expert Group members were reminded to read the background papers not formally presented to the meeting and provide comment back. These papers related to Disaster Risk Reduction Statistics and Indigenous Requirements in Statistics.

__Topic 5 – Future Work__

175.   It was decided that the future work programme be discussed by the Bureau once the action points and final report had been drafted. The Bureau would then report back to the Expert Group.

176.   The existing membership of the Bureau was reaffirmed by the Expert Group to continue the work required between the physical meetings of the Expert Group.

Annex 1 – Summary of Action Items

	Existing Action Items	Responsibility	Comments	Date Required
1	Work on raising profile of Expert Group, and of making classifications more relevant and visible	Bureau	Bureau to investigate ways of doing this, including the creation of a side event to the UN Statistical Commission and report back to the Expert Group	
2	ILO to provide specific words for clarifying on grading criteria	ILO	David Hunter to provide words to clarify aspects (on balance) of the criteria document and send to Bureau	Completed
3	Provide any further comments on grading criteria	All	Responses to be sent to Andrew and Ralf	12 Jun 2015
4	Clarify wording on whether adding levels to a classification makes it derived or not to the grading criteria	NZ	Update section in document and circulate to the Expert Group	
5	Further review definitions of reference, related and derived	All	Responses to be sent to Andrew and Ralf	
6	Add words to enforce/reiterate the need for good documentation for describing changes when deviating from reference classification	Andrew	Update of Criteria for inclusion document	
7	Comments on content of family list and propose additions or deletions	All	Everyone to review list presented by UNSD and add/delete as appropriate	26 Jun 2015
8	Have a common questionnaire for UNSD, UNESCO and FAO on the implementation of international classifications	UNSD/UNESCO /FAO	This possibility has to be further investigated.	
9	Provide feedback to UNSD on Pacific countries participation in national classification questionnaire response	SPC	SPC will get in touch with the countries to have the questionnaire completed.	30 Sep 2015
10	Send a questionnaire to international custodians to enable updating of the International Family of Classifications	UNSD		
11	Provide feedback to UNSD on African countries participation in national classification questionnaire response	South Africa		
12	Clarify the scope of the Family	Bureau		
13	Create broad framework of typology in relation to factory less production and present to the Expert Group	TSG-ISIC		31 Dec 2015
14	Update the ToR of the TSG-ISIC	Bureau		
15	Discuss approach or resolution for appropriateness of retail sales distinguished by sales channels resolution	TSG-ISIC		
16	Countries to provide information on adoption or use of environmental classifications	All		

17	Add Norbert to the TSG-ISIC	UNSD		
18	Provide country /national experience or knowledge on factory less producers to UNSD	All		
19	Contact AEG and ISWGNA proposing COICOP review and seek/advise collaboration	Andrew		
20	TSG-COICOP report to be passed to IMF	TSG-COICOP		
21	Ensure that Valentina Stoevska at ILO receives TSG-COICOP report and feedback contact for Prices Group	David Hunter		
22	Provide comments to clarify case law decisions as recommended by the TSG-COICOP	All		26 Jun 2015
23	First draft of revised COICOP	TSG-COICOP		31 Mar 2017
24	Issues raised by WTO in relation CPC	TSG-CPC		
25	Issues raised on ICT services and need for aggregated view	TSG-CPC		
26	Information to be provided to TSG_BF to make a deliberation as to whether there is a need to produce a Business Functions classification and make a recommendation to the Expert Group on a way forward.	Ronald Janssen		
27	Send GSIM information to UNGGIM	Klas		
28	Formalise relationship between UNEGISC and GGIM	Andrew		
29	Questions on HS to be circulated to the Expert Group for formal response and guidance to UNSD	All		
30	Establish mechanism for approval process for a new member of the International Family of Statistical Classifications	Bureau		
31	Review HS-BEC correspondence for better guidance on dual-use categories etc.	TSG-BEC		
32	TSG prepare BEC draft for Expert Group by end of September	TSG-BEC		30 Sept 2015
33	EG to approve BEC draft by November	All		30 Nov 2015
34	TSG-CPC to follow-up on EBOPS - CPC	TSG-CPC		
35	Provide information on CPC V2.1 changes to Ronald Janssen	TSG-CPC		
36	Establish contact with WCO through Tom Beris	Bureau		
37	Enrico Bisogno to send a link to ICCS	UNODC		Completed
38	Ronald Janssen to invite/enable Expert Group involvement in work team on taxonomy within GWG.	UNSD Trade		

39	SPC and FAO to collaborate on use of CPC in the Pacific	SPC/FAO	SPC will get in touch with FAO	
40	EBOPS to CPC concordance	TSG-CPC	To be recirculated around TSG for review	
41	HS to CPC and how differences are to be reconciled to be advised by Expert Group	All		
42	Expert Group to recommend to ILO that a technical working group be set up for ISCO	All		
43	Bureau to discuss potential Expert Group involvement with the working party on the review of ICSE	Bureau		
44	ILO to draft resolution for Expert Group to comment and input at 2017 meeting	ILO		31 Mar 2017
45	Provide comments on ICATUS	All	Review final draft of ICATUS for endorsement by EG before taking to UNSC	31 Dec 2015
46	EG to be involved in Big Data task team on cross-cutting issues (led by Italy), which includes classifications	UNSD Trade		
47	Advise Statistics Canada on where the Canadian reference in the homelessness definition was sourced	New Zealand		
48	Progress of Working Group on International Classifications (GTCI)	Mexico	Mexico will keep the Expert Group informed on progress and challenges for GTCI and will collaborate with the FAO	
49	Provide links on experiences of GSIM	All	To be supplied to Klas	
50	Provide information to complete the Global Inventory of Statistical Standards	All		
51	Explanatory notes for CPC Ver2.1 to be developed for agriculture, forest and fishery products	FAO/UNSD		Ongoing
51	Bureau to review action points and forward work program and circulate to EG	Bureau		31 Jul 2015

Annex 2 – List of Technical Subgroups

This is a list of the Technical Sub-groups that have been created by the Expert Group and that work directly under the guidance of the Expert Group.

Group	Members (coordinator in bold)
ISIC Rev 4	**UNSD,** Austria, Brazil, Canada, France, Morocco, New Zealand, Switzerland, USA, Eurostat, ILO
CPC Ver 2.1	**UNSD,** Canada, France, USA, Eurostat, FAO, IEA
COICOP	**Eurostat,** Austria, New Zealand, Philippines, Switzerland, FAO, ILO, UNECE
BEC	**UNSD-Trade,** Austria, New Zealand, Eurostat, OECD, WCO, UNDIO plus additional experts as identified by coordinator
Business Functions	**UNSD-Trade,** Australia, Canada, Denmark, India, New Zealand, OECD plus additional experts as identified by coordinator

Annex 3 – Bureau of the Expert Group

Andrew Hancock, New Zealand (Chair)
Alice Born, Canada
Ana Franco, Eurostat
Eva Castillo, Mexico
Severa de Costo, Philippines
Ralf Becker, UNSD (ex-officio)