Variance Estimation of Blended Import and Export Price Indexes with Census Trade Data

> Daniel K. Yang Office of Survey Methods Research U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2023 Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology (FCSM) Research & Policy Conference, Hyattsville, MD October 26th, 2023



Overview

- I. International Price Program (IPP) Survey
- II. Census Trade Data (CTD).
- III. Blended Import and Export Price Indexes (MXPI) Estimation.
- **IV.** Proposed Bootstrap Approach for CTD.
- V. Summary.



I. International Price Program (IPP) Survey

- □ IPP collects data on U. S. trade with foreign nations and produces Import and Export Price Indexes (MXPI).
- MXPI measure price changes of U.S. imports and exports (a Principal Federal Economic Indicator or PFEI).
 IPP Survey: 3-stage sampling design.



IPP Survey: 3-stage sampling design



II. Census Trade Data (CTD)

- Number of publishable detailed MXPI has declined over time.
- BLS is planning to implement an alternative data source: CTD for many commodity product areas.
- CTD contains detailed shipment records for nearly all imports and exports.



Impact of Census Trade Data Replacing Direct Data Collection by Panel (2019 Trade \$ Values—in Billions)

Trade Type	Panel	Area	Sample- Eligible \$ Value	Percentage Sample-Eligible \$ Value That Is Replaced	Percentage Sample- Eligible \$ Value That Is Replaced (within Panel)	Percentage Sample- Eligible \$ Value That Is Replaced (within Trade Type)
Export	А	Crude Materials	170.4	57%	6404	
Export	А	Food & Beverages	108.8	91%	61%	33%
Export	A	Minerals, Chemicals, & Rubber Miscellaneous	333.9	72% 4%		
Export	B	Machinery	431.8	3%	2%	
Export	В	Vehicles	190.6	0%	270	
Import	А	Crude Materials	356.3	45%	40%	
Import	А	Food & Beverages	158.0	84%		33%
Import	А	Vehicles	332.9	20%		
Import	А	Miscellaneous	203.8	28%		
Import	В	Machinery	713.7	17%		
Import	В	Minerals, Chemicals, & Rubber	397.1	46%	28%	



Census Trade Data Increases Published Detailed MXPI



Harmonized System Detailed Product **Categories are Basic Classification** Group to Calculate Aggregate MXPIs **BEA End Use** Classification North Harmonized American System Industry HTSA (M) Classification Schedule B (X) System Harmonized System Detailed Product Category 8 — U.S. BURFAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Census Trade Data Source

as Share of Harmonized Product Categories

Import End Use Index Harmonized Commodity Classification Codes Representation							
Index Weight	Total Number of Harmonized	Number of Harmonized Codes	Percentage of Harmonized Codes				
Year	Codes in Index	Represented by Census Trade Data	Represented by Census Trade Data				
2019	17,686	8,034	45%				
2020	17,627	7,988	45%				
2021	17,771	8,108	46%				
Export End Use Index Harmonized Commodity Classification Codes Representation							
Export End Use	Index Harmonized Commodity	Classification Codes Representation					
Export End Use Index Weight	Index Harmonized Commodity Total Number of Harmonized	Classification Codes Representation Number of Harmonized Codes	Percentage of Harmonized Codes				
Export End Use Index Weight Year	Index Harmonized Commodity Total Number of Harmonized Codes Used in Indexes	Classification Codes Representation Number of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data	Percentage of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data				
Export End Use Index Weight Year 2019	Index Harmonized Commodity Total Number of Harmonized Codes Used in Indexes 9,006	Classification Codes Representation Number of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data 4,177	Percentage of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data 46%				
Export End Use Index Weight Year 2019 2020	Index Harmonized Commodity Total Number of Harmonized Codes Used in Indexes 9,006 8,983	Classification Codes Representation Number of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data 4,177 4,180	Percentage of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data 46% 47%				
Export End Use Index Weight Year 2019 2020 2021	Index Harmonized Commodity Total Number of Harmonized Codes Used in Indexes 9,006 8,983 9,000	Classification Codes Representation Number of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data 4,177 4,180 4,183	Percentage of Harmonized Codes Represented by Census Trade Data 46% 47% 46%				



Data Source Differences

□ IPP Survey Data:



CTD Administrative Data:





Data Source Error Type

IPP Survey Data represents a share of trade across U.S. borders
 Sampling error

CTD Administrative Data represents all trade across U.S. borders

Missing data error (some records do not have complete entries)

Outlier exclusion error (some records are excluded because their price deviates far from the mean)



III. Blended MXPI Estimate

Lohr (2021) blended estimator proposal.

MXPI will be estimated from dual data sources: IPP Survey and CTD admin data.

$$\widehat{Y}(\theta) = \theta \widehat{Y}_{\{1,2\}}^{(1)} + (1-\theta)Y_{\{1,2\}}^{(2)}$$

 $\Box \theta$ – proportion

At Stratum-Lower level (SL),

$$\hat{Y}_{sl}(\theta_{sl}) = \theta_{sl}\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(1)} + (1 - \theta_{sl})\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(2)}$$



Variance Approximation for Blended MXPI Estimate

The derivatives of $\hat{Y}_{sl}(\theta_{sl})$:

$$\frac{\partial Y_{sl}}{\partial \theta_{sl}} = Y_{sl}^{(1)} - Y_{sl}^{(2)}, \quad \frac{\partial Y_{sl}}{\partial Y_{sl}^{(1)}} = \theta_{sl}, \quad \frac{\partial Y_{sl}}{\partial Y_{sl}^{(2)}} = 1 - \theta_{sl}$$

 $\Box \text{ Taylor Series Linearization (TSL) variance approximation:}$ $\hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{sl}(\theta_{sl})\right) = \left(\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(1)} - \hat{Y}_{sl}^{(2)}\right)^2 \hat{V}(\hat{\theta}_{sl}) + \hat{\theta}_{sl}^2 \hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(1)}\right) + \left(1 - \hat{\theta}_{sl}\right)^2 \hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(2)}\right) + \left(1 - \hat{\theta}_{sl}\right)^2 \hat{V}\left(\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(2)}\right) + 2\left(\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(1)} - \hat{Y}_{sl}^{(2)}\right) \hat{\theta}_{sl} Cov\left(\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(1)}, \hat{\theta}_{sl}\right) + 2\hat{\theta}_{sl}(1 - \hat{\theta}_{sl})Cov\left(\hat{Y}_{sl}^{(2)}, \hat{\theta}_{sl}\right)$



Propagation of Uncertainty

Groves and Lyberg (2010):

Presence of potential error propagation may not be ignored in the CTD administrative data.

□ Borrowing information from Census improves the estimate.



IV. A Bootstrap Approach for IPP Sample

- Select only directly collected items from CGs and determine that they have not been discontinued as of the month being calculated.
- □ Further select items that contribute weights to the MXPI.
- Maintain consistency of sampling population.
- □ Use simple random sampling with replacement (SRSWR).



IV. Proposed Bootstrap Approach for CTD

Resampling at CG level for CTD.
 Select only "usable" CTD items from CGs.
 Maintain consistency of sampling population.
 Use simple random sampling with replacement (SRSWR)



Bootstrap Estimate of Blended Indexes

□ Blended SL level estimate at Bootstrap run *b*: $\hat{\theta}_{bsl} = (1 - \hat{p}_{bsl})\hat{\theta}_{bsl}^{IPP} + \hat{p}_{bsl}\hat{\theta}_{bsl}^{CTD}$

 \Box Bootstrap mean and variance estimates of θ_{sl} :

$$\hat{\theta}_{sl} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \hat{\theta}_{bsl}, \quad var(\hat{\theta}_{sl}) = \frac{1}{B-1} \sum_{b=1}^{B} (\hat{\theta}_{bsl} - \hat{\theta}_{sl})^2$$

 \Box Bootstrap standard error (SE) and relative SE (RSE) of $\hat{\theta}_{sl}$:

$$SE(\hat{\theta}_{sl}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{B-1} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \left(\hat{\theta}_{bsl} - \hat{\theta}_{sl}\right)^2}, \qquad RSE(\hat{\theta}_{sl}) = \frac{SE(\hat{\theta}_{sl})}{\hat{\theta}_{sl}} \times 100$$



Summary

- Alternative data source (frame) like CTD administrative data is here to stay.
- Blended estimates present challenges to establishment surveys and opportunities to improve.
- Researchers need evaluate the complex structure of administrative data and the means to access it.
- □ Be adaptive and ...



THANK YOU!

<u>yang.daniel@bls.gov</u> Office of Survey Methods Research (OSMR) Bureau of Labor Statistics





Council of Professional Associations on Federal Statistics

