LABOUR COSTS WORKSHOP

Rome, 5-6 May 2015

Calendar and Seasonal adjustment of the LCI: direct versus indirect approach. The Italian experience

Anna Ciammola and Donatella Tuzi



Layout

Background

- The LCI system: EC Regulations on compilation and CA/SA
- The Italian LCI
 - ✓ Sources and compilation methods
 - ✓ CA and SA: from direct towards indirect approach

Our contribution

- Chain linking and CA/SA of aggregated indicators
 - ✓ The suggested approach by ESS Guidelines on SA
 - ✓ Our proposal

Final remarks



The LCI Regulation and Eurostat practice (1)

EC-R 450/2003

Quarterly comparable hourly indices on total labour cost (TOT), wages and salaries (WAG), other costs (OTH)

- ✓ Elementary indices at section level (B to S NACE Rev. 2)
- ✓ Laspeyres indices, chain linked annually, for the aggregates (B-E, B-F, G-J, K-N, O-S, G-N, B-N, B-S)



The LCI Regulation and Eurostat practice (2) EC-R 1216/2003

Transmission of LCI in unadjusted (**UNADJ**), calendar adjusted (**CA**) and seasonally adjusted (**SA**) form

- ✓ Approach/method for CA / SA → reference to the ESS Guidelines on SA
- ✓ CA European aggregates from national CA figures
- ✓ SA European aggregates from CA European aggregates (direct approach)
- ✓ Inconsistency check on CA / SA national series → components hidden if differ by more than 2 decimal points from the total



The LCI system (1)





The system of Italian LCI (2)







The Italian LCI: sources and methods



LES: census monthly survey on large enterprises;

VELA: quarterly sample survey on job vacancies and hours worked;

OROS: survey on employment, wages and labour cost (based on Social Security data);

QNA: quarterly National Accounts data.

CA / SA of the Italian LCI

ightarrow CA ightarrow Reg-ARIMA models (TRAMO)

- ✓ One regression variable
- ✓ Calendar effects more evident in the industrial sectors
- > SA \rightarrow ARIMA model based approach (SEATS)
 - ✓ Strong seasonality
 - \checkmark WAG series more regular and stable than OTH series
- > Revision policy \rightarrow partial concurrent approach
 - ✓ (Re)-identification of reg-ARIMA models once a year through JDemetra+
 - ✓ Current processing through Tramo/Seats for Linux
 - ✓ Quarterly check for quality of SA through both JDemetra+ and Tramo/Seats



CA / SA of the Italian LCI: from direct towards indirect

Direct approach

- Inconsistency between WAG and OTH components and TOT aggregate (severe in case of few components)
- Expediencies to reduce incoherencies
 - ✓ Approximation of the ARIMA models for the sectorial aggregates to the models for the main NACE sections
 - Approximation of the ARIMA models for OTH series to the model for the corresponding WAG series

Large revisions

Indirect approach (June 2009)



Implementing the indirect approach (1)

ESS guidelines on SA

Unchaining

Aggregation

Chaining

> Pros

- ✓ Standard approach **easy** to implement
- Exploiting of annual weights used to aggregate undjusted indices

> Cons

✓ Inefficient

✓ Need of CA annual weights with significant calendar effects (see example 1)





Example 1

	Weights		Unadjusted indices								
Year			U	nchaine	ed	Ch	GR%				
	C1	C2	C1	C2	Α	C1	C2	Α	Α		
BY+1	7.00	3.00	101.0	101.0	101.0	101.0	101.0	101.0	1.0		
BY+2	7.07	3.03	114.3	133.3	120.0	115.4	134.7	121.2	20.0		
BY+3	8.08	4.04	112.5	125.0	116.7	129.9	168.3	141.4	16.7		
BY+4	9.09	5.05	111.1	120.0	114.3	144.3	202.0	161.6	14.3		

	Mai	abto	Calendar adjusted indices								
Year	weights		Chain linked		Unchained			CL	GR%		
	C1	C2	C1	C2	C1	C2	Α	Α	Α		
BY+1	7.00	3.00	101.0	105.0	101.0	105.0	102.2	102.2	?		
BY+2	7.07	3.03	115.4	140.0	114.3	133.3	120.0	122.6	20.0		
BY+3	8.08	4.04	129.9	175.0	112.5	125.0	116.7	143.1	16.7		
BY+4	9.09	5.05	144.3	190.0	111.1	108.6	110.2	157.7	10.2		

11

Labour Costs Workshop - Rome, 5-6 May 2015



Implementing the indirect approach (2)

Our proposal

Aggregation

New annual weights

> Pros

- ✓ Efficient
- Aggregation of chain linked indices

> Cons

- ✓ Handling of two weighting systems
- ✓ New component weights (see example 2)
 - Dependency on the aggregate
 - Not additive



Example 2

Components rightarrow C_1, C_2, C_3

Aggregates $A_{1} = f(C_{1}, C_{2})$ $A_{2} = g_{1}(C_{1}, C_{2}, C_{3}) \text{ or } A_{2} = g_{2}(A_{1}, C_{3})$ $A_{1,t_{y}} = \sum_{c=1}^{2} w_{c,y-1}C_{c,t_{y}} \quad \forall y = 1, ..., Y$ $A_{2,t_{y}} = \sum_{c=1}^{3} \omega_{c,y-1}C_{c,t_{y}} \quad \forall y = 1, ..., Y$ $W_{1,y} \neq \omega_{1,y}$ $W_{2,y} \neq \omega_{2,y}$

$$A_{2,t_y} = \pi_{a_1,y-1}A_{1,t_y} + \pi_{c_3,y-1}C_{3,t_y} \implies \pi_{a_1,y} \neq \omega_{1,y} + \omega_{2,y}$$



Comparison between direct and indirect approach

Plots of SA data and q-o-q growth rates



- Residual seasonality
- Revisions history diagnostics
 - ✓ Concurrent target
 - % revisions of SA data and revisions on q-o-q growth rates
 - ✓ Revisions after 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12 step-ahead



Final remarks

Internal coherence

Crucial criterion in the choice of the **indirect** approach to SA

> Aggregation of chain linked indices

Handling non additivity through a new set of weights

> Outperformance of the indirect approach

- ✓ From a practical point of view (ARIMA models, SA specifications, …)
- ✓ In terms of revisions of SA data



Thank you for your attention

ciammola@istat.it tuzi@istat.it



PLOTS SA series







PLOTS

q-o-q growth rates of SA series (%)

WAG

OTH

ΤΟΤ





Incoherencies between variables (TOT versus WAG and OTH) and sectors (aggregates versus NACE sect.) Percentages on the total number of q-on-quarter changes

Aggregate	No. of	3 doc	1 doc	
Aggregate	compon.	S uec.	T dec.	
Nace Rev. 2 sections and aggregates – Total labour cost vs wages an	d other costs	•		
B – Mining and Quarrying	2	30.0	26.7	
C - Manufacturing	2	8.3	1.7	
D - Electricity, Gas, Stream and Air Conditioning Supply	2	3.3	1.7	
E - Water Supply; Sewerage, Waste Management,	2	6.7	1.7	
F - Construction	2	15.0	5.0	
G - Wholesale and retail trade	2	6.7	1.7	
H - Transport	2	5.0	-	
I - Accommodation and food service activities	2	1.7	-	
J - Information and communication	2	15.0	8.3	
K - Financial and insurance activities	2	3.3	-	
L - Real estate activities	2	3.3	-	
M - Scientific and technical activities	2	5.0	-	
N - Administrative and support service activities	2	1.7	-	
O - Public administration and defence; compulsory Social Security	2	23.3	20.0	
P - Education	2	15.0	15.0	
Q - Human health and social work activities	2	-	-	
R – Arts, entertainment and recreation	2	3.3	1.7	
S – Other service activities	2	6.7	1.7	
B-S – Whole economy	2	6.7	1.7	
B-N - Business economy	2	16.7	-	
B-E – Industry (except construction)	2	6.7	-	
B-F - Industry and construction	2	3.3	-	
G-N - Services	2	6.7	1.7	
G-J - Wholesale and ret. trade; transport; accomm. and food service activities; infor. and commu.	2	1.7	-	
K-N - Financial and ins. activities; real estate activities; professional, scientific and technical	2	3.3	-	

Incoherencies between sectors (aggregates versus sectorial components) Percentages on the total number of q-on-quarter changes

Aggregate	No. of compon.	3 dec.	1 dec.	
Labour cost compo	onents – NACE rev. 2 aggr	egates vs sections		
	Wages	18	0.0	0.0
B-S – Whole economy	Other costs	18	0.0	0.0
	Total costs	18	0.0	0.0
	Wages	13	0.0	0.0
B-N - Business economy	Other costs	13	0.0	0.0
	Total costs	13	0.0	0.0
	Wages	4	0.0	0.0
B-E - Industry (except construction)	Other costs	4	3.3	1.7
	Total costs	4	1.7	0
	Wages	5	0.0	0.0
B-F – Industry and construction	Other costs	5	1.7	1.7
	Total costs	5	1.7	1.7
	Wages	8	0.0	0.0
G-N - Services	Other costs	8	0.0	0.0
	Total costs	8	0.0	0.0
G-J - Wholesale and retail trade; transport;	Wages	4	3.3	3.3
accommodation and food service	Other costs	4	6.7	3.3
activities;	Total costs	4	1.7	1.7
K-N - Financial and insurance activities:	Wages	4	1.7	1.7
real estate activities; professional,	Other costs	4	3.3	3.3
scientific and technical activities;	Total costs	4	3.3	1.7
	Wages	5	1.7	1.7
O-S – Mainly non-business economy	Other costs	5	0.0	0.0
	Total costs	5	0.0	0.0

Incoherencies between sectors (aggregates versus sectorial components) Percentages on the total number of q-on-quarter changes

Aggrogato	No. of	3	1	
Aggregate		components	decimals	decimal
Labour cost components	regates vs sub	aggregates		
B-S – Whole economy	Wages	2	5.0	5.0
(B-N + O-S)	Other costs	2	11.7	6.7
	Total costs	2	13.3	10
B-N - Business economy	Wages	2	16.7	7.0
(B-F + G-N)	Other costs	2	5.0	1.7
	Total costs	2	8.3	5.0
B-F – Industry and construction	Wages	2	8.3	3.3
(B-E + F)	Other costs	2	8.3	5.0
	Total costs	2	6.7	3.3
G-N - Services	Wages	2	15.0	8.3
(G-J +K-N)	Other costs	2	3.3	0.0
	Total costs	2	10.0	5.0



Revisions history on total labour cost

Revisions on q-o-q growth rates

Approach	Stone		0_S	-		B_N	-	B_S		
	Steps	MR	MAR	RMSR	MR	MAR	RMSR	MR	MAR	RMSR
	1	-0.019	0.069	0.092	-0.028	0.053	0.067	0.000	0.038	0.054
	2	-0.081	0.124	0.18	-0.05	0.075	0.088	-0.034	0.056	0.078
ect	3	-0.285	0.313	0.394	-0.115	0.146	0.179	-0.067	0.103	0.126
Dir	4	-0.025	0.439	0.532	-0.031	0.208	0.259	-0.010	0.167	0.202
	8	-0.091	0.763	0.904	-0.072	0.270	0.305	-0.051	0.247	0.301
	12	-0.097	0.847	1.050	-0.114	0.336	0.368	-0.068	0.287	0.350
	1	-0.011	0.049	0.06	-0.029	0.074	0.092	-0.023	0.051	0.066
	2	-0.060	0.088	0.135	-0.042	0.077	0.105	-0.048	0.072	0.104
rect	3	-0.283	0.301	0.378	-0.094	0.125	0.166	-0.16	0.164	0.194
Indii	4	-0.025	0.417	0.534	-0.017	0.173	0.222	-0.018	0.169	0.189
	8	-0.090	0.739	0.914	-0.051	0.232	0.265	-0.062	0.240	0.270
	12	-0.088	0.853	1.098	-0.073	0.268	0.310	-0.075	0.290	0.330

Revisions history on total labour cost

% revisions of SA data

Approach	Stone	O_S			B_N			B_S		
	Sieps	MR	MAR	RMSR	MR	MAR	RMSR	MR	MAR	RMSR
	1	-0.093	0.134	0.171	-0.058	0.097	0.132	-0.027	0.061	0.085
	2	-0.175	0.195	0.233	-0.085	0.119	0.148	-0.054	0.072	0.117
ect	3	-0.199	0.228	0.259	-0.088	0.117	0.145	-0.053	0.075	0.118
Dir	4	-0.03	0.283	0.316	-0.031	0.146	0.18	-0.023	0.114	0.153
	8	-0.1	0.459	0.512	-0.062	0.201	0.238	-0.073	0.19	0.245
	12	-0.134	0.58	0.642	-0.114	0.224	0.262	-0.112	0.251	0.295
	1	-0.087	0.129	0.168	-0.049	0.102	0.128	-0.063	0.081	0.098
	2	-0.169	0.184	0.227	-0.065	0.102	0.133	-0.102	0.11	0.142
rect	3	-0.209	0.219	0.256	-0.066	0.099	0.137	-0.116	0.118	0.152
Indi	4	-0.028	0.271	0.321	-0.017	0.124	0.153	-0.021	0.106	0.138
	8	-0.099	0.466	0.531	-0.045	0.157	0.196	-0.065	0.161	0.202
	12	-0.128	0.622	0.678	-0.08	0.163	0.205	-0.099	0.23	0.256