

Changes in comparison with previous versions of the GGDC Total Economy Database (September 2006)

This document explains the changes between the August 2006 version of the GGDC Total Economy Database and the previous version of January 2006. The description below refers to the most significant changes. For more detail the source notes can be consulted. Comparisons of earlier versions of the database are described in separate documents downloadable from <http://www.ggdc.net/dseries/tedarchive.html>

Differences between January 2006 and September 2006

General changes:

The Total Economy Database has been extended with a number of countries, mainly from Latin America and Africa. GDP, Population, Labour Force and Productivity figures for Barbados, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Puerto Rico, St. Lucia, Trinidad & Tobago, Uruguay, Angola, Burkina Faso, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Niger, Senegal, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe are available now as well. Data for Cambodia has been added as well.

GDP

New sources:

- Eurostat National Accounts (from New Cronos database, August 2006)
- OECD National Accounts, Vol. 1, 2006, release 01
- European Economy, Statistical Annex, Spring 2006, DG ECFIN, EU
- ADB, Key indicators of Developing Asian and Pacific Countries, 2006
- ADB, Asian Development Outlook, Spring 2006
- OECD GDP, monthly update (August 2006)
- International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, April 2006
- Economic Survey of Latin America and the Caribbean, 2004-2005, published August 2005
- "Contours of the World Economy: The Pace and Pattern of Change 1-2030 AD", Maddison, Cambridge University Press, forthcoming

Other:

-In previous versions of the Total Economy Database the EKS productivity figures were calculated on basis of the 2002 OECD EKS PPPs (OECD, Purchasing Power Parities 2002, Paris, January 2005). As we prefer to express all series the most recent prices (2005 benchmark), we actually need 2005 PPPs. As these are not available yet, the next best thing is to 'update' the 2002 EKS PPPs. We have done this by calculating differences in aggregate inflation rates for each country relative to the United States and applying these trends to the 2002 EKS PPPs (note: January 2006 Total Economy Database also had the 2005 EKS GDP).

-A lot of European countries have reallocated FISIM in the latest version of their National Accounts (NA). In the January 2006 version of the Total Economy Database the OECD figures did not include these reallocations, and therefore we switched to Eurostat data for some countries (as those data were more up to date). However the

latest OECD figures include National Accounts data that include the reallocation of FISIM. As a result of this the Eurostat and OECD NA data are the same for all OECD countries except Iceland and Portugal. Except for these countries we have switched back to OECD NA data as the basic data source.

-For two countries (i.e. the Netherlands and France) the latest releases of the National Accounts are not reflected in the OECD National Accounts data. Therefore for the Netherlands for the years 1995-2005 and for France for the years 1991-2004 we have switched to National Accounts data from the statistical offices instead of OECD NA.

Most notable changes due to new sources are the following: France (from 0.1% to 1.4% for the 1992-2004 period), Iceland (ranging from -0.5 to -3.4% in the 1993-2005 period, revision in OECD NA), Netherlands (from +0.2% to -2.9% in the period 1995-2005, revision in NA), UK (small changes for period 1992-2005), Latvia (ranging from -1.3% to -2.6% in 1999-2005), Myanmar (-7.6% in 2005), Chili (ranging from -2.5% to 5.0% in the period 1950-1989), (Jordan (-1.8% for the 1992-2004 period), Kuwait (ranging from -2.6% to -10% in the 2000-2004 period), Syria (ranging from -4% to +17% in the 1991-2004 period), United Arab Emirates (ranging from -0.5 to +7.6% in the 1995-2004 period), Egypt (level adjustment in 1992 of -4.5%, trend thereafter still the same), Nigeria (level adjustment of 1.7% in 1991, trend thereafter still the same), Sudan (ranging from 2.7% to 12.7% in the period 1991 to 2004).

For a number of OECD countries there has been a level adjustment to the EKS GDP figures due to a revision in the current GDP. Largest changes are observed for: Australia, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Malta and the Netherlands (changes in the Netherlands partly due to use of National Accounts data instead of OECD data). France also has an adjustment in EKS GDP level due to the use of French National Accounts for the 1991-2004 period (instead of OECD NA).

Employment:

New sources:

- BLS, Comparative Civilian Labour Force Statistics, Ten countries, 1960-2005, April 2006 version
- OECD Economic Outlook 79, June 2006
- ILO, Laborsta Database 2006, July version
- OECD National Accounts, Volume 1, 2006, release 1
- Eurostat National Accounts (from New Cronos database, August 2006)
- European Economy, Statistical Annex, Spring 2006, DG ECFIN, EU
- World Bank, World Development Indicators 2006
- OECD LFS 2006, Summary tables.

Other:

After thorough research¹ into the construction of employment figures in the national accounts, the decision has been made to replace data from the Labour Force Survey by employment numbers from the National Accounts for another set of countries. The

¹ See Gerard Ypma and Bart van Ark (2006), [Employment and Hours Worked in National Accounts: A Producer's View on Methods and a User's View on Applicability](#), EU KLEMS Working paper no. 10. Downloadable on [http://www.euklems.net/pub/no10\(online\).pdf](http://www.euklems.net/pub/no10(online).pdf).

main reason for this change is the greater consistency with the GDP figures. Employment from the Labour Force Survey is measured according to the national concept. This means that the inhabitants working abroad are counted in the employment figures, while foreigners working within the economic territory are not counted. National Accounts employment uses the domestic concept, which is consistent with the measurement of output figures. In most countries the differences between the national and domestic concept do not lead to large differences, but especially in smaller countries the effect on productivity can be significant. In the previous database we did already change to National Accounts employment for Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia and the Baltic States. In this version we also switch to the National Accounts employment for Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Slovak Republic and Sweden. The largest differences appear by the change from BLS to National Accounts employment in Germany. The employment figures for Germany have been built up from a large number of sources and show a level that is more than 8% higher than the BLS.

We decided to change the employment source only if we are confident about the method used to construct these figures. A number of countries provide employment figures in jobs instead of in persons (Austria, Canada, Greece, Japan, Switzerland), which makes national accounts employment unsuitable for our database. For these countries we still rely on the Labour Force Statistics. However, instead of the civilian employment numbers from the LFS, we use total employment from the same source now, which leads to upward changes ranging from 0 to 2.5%.

For the Iceland, Ireland, Korea, New Zealand, Poland and Turkey it is not clear enough how national accounts employment has been constructed, which is the reason we continue to use Labour Force Survey data for these countries. For some countries we based employment figures on the BLS. This ensured an optimal comparability with the employment figures for the United States. However, now we have changed to BLS-CPS (and BEA for the military staff) for the United States, and in order to incorporate military personnel we use other sources (OECD LFS) for Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom as well.

Some other notable changes are observed for: Cyprus (ranging from -2.5 to -8% in the period 2000-20004), Germany (switch to National Accounts employment leads to differences up to 8%), Italy (ranging from -0.6% to -1.4% in the 1994-2004 period), Malta (ranging from 0.7% to 1.3% in the 2002-2005 period), Netherlands (2.3 to 4.1% level adjustments for the pre-2000 period due to revision in national accounts and the switch to other sources), Lithuania (large revision in Eurostat data causing a drop in employment ranging from 10-12% in the period 1995-1999, from 2000 figures are the same as before) and Slovenia (combination of revision of Eurostat data and Worldbank data, ranging from 9.5% to 20% higher in the 1960-1995 period). Due to revisions in the World Development Indicators from the Worldbank some countries experienced large changes, most notable are: Azerbaijan (up to 10% lower in 1960), Bosnia & Herzegovina (ranging from 2.8% to 17% higher in the 1960-2004 period), Israel (10% to 12% lower over the 1980-2004 period), Kuwait (ranging from 7% lower in 1980 to 23% higher in 1997), Oman (ranging from 1% lower in 1980 to 26% higher in 1999), Syria (ranging from 5% lower in 1980 to 17% higher in 2004), Yemen (from 20% lower in 1980 to 4% lower in 2004), Egypt (ranging from 23%

lower in 1980 to 6% lower in 1989 to 24% in 2004), Kenya (ranging from 16% to 12% lower in the 1980-2004 period), Morocco (ranging from 26% to 14% lower in the 1980 to 2004 period), Nigeria (ranging from 18 to 20% higher in the 1980 to 2004 period) and Sudan (ranging from 10% to 34% lower in the 1980-2004 period). The backwards extended OECD LFS series do also lead to some differences in the period 1960-1970 for Greece, Japan, Portugal and Australia.

Hours:

New sources:

- OECD Employment Outlook, 2006
- Eurostat New Cronos Database (August 2006)
- DGBAS, Monthly bulletin of statistics, June 2006

Notable changes: In the previous version 2005 working hours was assumed the same as 2004 working hours. As data for 2005 is now available for most OECD countries (in the form of the OECD Employment Outlook) this has now been used for 2005. This changes hours worked for most OECD countries. For Cyprus, Malta, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Slovenia there is national accounts hours data now, which replaces the estimations we used before. This leads to extensive decreases in the number of hours, ranging from 10% (Estonia, Malta, Slovenia) to 20% (Cyprus, Latvia and Lithuania).

For a number of countries (Czech Republic, Denmark, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Finland, Sweden and Slovak Republic), we switched from OECD STI or Employment Outlook numbers to national accounts numbers (derived from Eurostat New Chronos database, August 2006 version). For Japan we moved to OECD STI and Employment Outlook, instead of the old source (Pilat).

Population:

New sources:

- "Contours of the World Economy: The Pace and Pattern of Change 1-2030 AD", Maddison, Cambridge University Press, forthcoming

Most notable changes: All changes are due to revisions of Maddison data (as compared to his previous set of population data). Portugal (ranging from -0.7% to 2.1% in 1994-1998 period), Albania (ranging from -1.7% to -5.4% in 1991-2004 period), Armenia (ranging from -0.7% to +11.2% in the 1991-2004 period), Bosnia and Herzegovina (ranging from -10% to +5% in the 1992-2004 period), Georgia (ranging from 0.6% to 5.7% in the period 1990-2004), Kazakhstan (ranging from 0.6% to 10% in the period 1982-2004 period), Slovenia (ranging from -0.5% to +5.4% in the period 1980-2004), Hong Kong (ranging from +1.7% to 4.1% in the 1997-2004 period), Myanmar (ranging from -0.5% to -5.8% in the 1982-2004 period), Saudi Arabia (ranging from -0.5% to 6.7% in the 1980-2004 period), Congo (ranging from -0.5% to -3.3% in the 1956-1997 period), Ethiopia (ranging from -2.5% to 0.9% in the 1966-2004 period), Nigeria (ranging from 0.5% to 7.5% in the 1974-2004 period), South Africa (ranging from -0.5% to 3.9% in the 1981-2004 period).