

# The use of imputation in Danish RTI

By Søren Kühl Andersen

# Content

---

- New publication schedule -> More imputation
- Extend
- Methods
- Simulation studies on revisions

## New publication schedule

---

- First publication at  $t+20$  -  $t+22$ 
  - Provisional figures only at three main commodity groups
  - 4 NACE aggregates to Eurostat
- Provisional detailed industry figures one month later
  - Commodity groups revised
  - 13 NACE aggregates to Eurostat
- Final figures on all levels on month later

# New publication schedule

---

What does that mean?

- We shortened the production time by approximately 10 days
  - Satisfies users (media, businesses, banks)
  - Lower response rates
  - New deadlines
  - **More imputation**
- Provisional figures are revised twice
  - Late data is incorporated to a larger extend
- Only one publishing day per month
  - Easier to organize
  - But now three months are handles simultaneously

# The extend of imputation

---

- No mass-imputations
  - Only where necessary
- Just over 100 units are kept out of grossing up calculations
  - They contribute only with own TO
  - Imputed values needed in case of non-response!
- Why are those 100 units special?
  - We do not wish to or cannot include them in regular estimation methods
  - They are large
  - Some are artificial units
    - Collection of more enterprises
    - Split of one enterprise into more units
    - A few units with main activity outside RT

## The extend of imputation

---

- Small industry groups without any responding units
  - Imputation of three units
  - Happens rarely
- Results from simulation studies:
  - 8-20 units needed imputation
  - In reality it will be fewer (4 for May 2012)

## Methods – currently in use

---

1. Carry forward the growth rate of unit from same month last year

$$T_t = T_{t-1} \cdot T_{t-12} / T_{t-13}$$

### Advantages:

- Suited for units with own seasonal pattern (often the case with large units)
- Unaffected by possible errors or outliers among other responses

## Methods – currently in use

---

### Disadvantages

- $T_{t-1}$ ,  $T_{t-12}$  and  $T_{t-13}$  all must be available
- Unsuitable for months including Easter
- Not useable in case of special occurrences around  $t - 12$  (structural changes etc.)
- Does not take into account trend changes among similar enterprises



## Methods – currently in use

---

2. Apply growth rate for actual month for units in same industry and size group

$$T_t = T_{t-1} \cdot \sum_{i \in M} T_t^i / \sum_{i \in M} T_{t-1}^i,$$

Where  $M$  is the matched sample set of units from same industry and size group, responding in both  $t$  and  $t - 1$ .

## Methods – currently in use

---

### Advantages:

- Can be used if there is no data on the unit from  $t - 12$  or  $t - 13$
- Can be used in “Easter months”
- Unaffected by structural changes in previous year

## Methods – currently in use

---

### Disadvantages:

- Does not take into account units' special seasonal pattern
- Affected by outliers/errors among similar units
- A sort of “mean imputation”, which is bad!

## Methods – currently in use

---

3. Carry forward the average of the three previous months

$$T_t = T_{t-1} + T_{t-2} + T_{t-3}/3,$$

adjusted for non-response.

Only to be used when method 1 and 2 cannot be used (no data from  $T_{t-1}$  or no data on similar units).

## Methods – current practice

---

Now in production:

Methods prioritized depending on month:

In Mar, Apr and May:

2., 1., 3.

In other months:

1., 2., 3.

Output:

Imputed values for manual checking

List of units still needing manual imputation  
(rare)

# Methods

---

Other methods to consider:

- A mix of 1. and 2. (when 1. is not possible) – use growth rate of similar units, but adjust for the units' historical derivation.
- A more general version of 1., using for example  $T_{t-2} \cdot T_{t-12} / T_{t-14}$  or average of similar growth rates
- A more general version of 2., using for example  $T_{t-2}$ ,  $T_{t-3}$  or  $T_{t-4}$  or average growth rates for similar units in more periods
- Additional “safety nets” to method 3., using for example older VAT data.

# Methods

---

Implementing further methods would require:

- A database cleaned for outliers due to structural changes
- A lot of programming
- Real-time simulation-based choosing of best method in each individual case

Why not?

Not enough time – and current practice showed good results!

# Simulation studies on revisions

---

- Simulation:
  - First estimates produced at  $t+17$ - $t+19$
  - Comparing to estimates produced on  $t+47$ - $t+49$  and  $t+77$ - $t+79$
- Imputation:
  - Current practice
  - Different priorities
  - More units for imputation (all of biggest size group, all)



# Simulation studies on revisions

---

## Results:

- Response rate compared to t+28 drops from around 85 to 70
- 8-20 of the special units needed imputation, regularly very big ones
- Revision from 1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> published figures between -0.2 and 0.3 – bigger on commodity groups
- Slight positive bias around 0.1, equal among commodity groups

# Simulation studies on revisions

---

- First early publication: May figures on 22<sup>nd</sup> June
  - Response rate over 80!
  - Only 4 imputed values (hereof two large petrol station companies)
- New deadline (pushed from 11<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup>)
- New reminding schedule:
  - 1<sup>st</sup> reminder on 10<sup>th</sup>
  - Deadline 16<sup>th</sup>
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> reminder by 17<sup>th</sup> (e-mails, letters and **phone to the special units**)