

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

Communication has to be tailored to the audience: the neighbour needs may be different from the research institutes

Jean Malherbe from France had the same idea to develop a site for international discussions on NA issues: <http://www.comptanat.fr>

**Peter van de Ven:**

In my experience there are also lots of misunderstandings between national accountants and our primary users, such as people involved in economic policy and research. Are there any ideas about better reaching out to them?

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@Peter:* I think, NSI should feel responsible for the NA education of their main users (politics and selected journalists)

**Katri Soinne:**

The specific, exact terms in this system are both a strength and a weakness - national accountants easily forget that those terms do not have meaning outside NA, and we expect everybody to understand them. Our work is not done, when the figures are ready, we should go further and explain what the figures are telling and how they should not be used.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

I see an advantage, when NA terms are outside the daily language, otherwise they will be misinterpreted according the daily usage

**Peter van de Ven:**

*@Ligia:* I guess it's more complicated than that. When communicating, two parties are involved.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@Peter:* and the communicator should ensure that his message is understood.

**Katri Soinne:**

We just had a MOOC (=massive open online course) on national accounts, organized in co-operation between Statistics Finland and the Helsinki Open University. We had almost 450 registered participants, out of which more than 120 also made the end test and received their study points. The videos will be available via Statistics Finland website for anybody who wants to see, and for example people in Bank of Finland and the Ministry of Finance have found them useful.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@Katri:* Is any info about the participants?

**Katri Soinne:**

*@Ligia:* I totally agree that we need specific terms, but the challenge is to communicate them in the "real world". If I use a concept no-one understands (or they have just some weak idea about it), they do not understand my point.

**Canada\_Brenda Bugge:**

*@Katri:* Is the content available in English?

**Katri Soinne:**

*@Ligia:* Mainly students from every university in Finland, and some from different universities of applied sciences, as well. Also people from different ministries etc, and a lot of people, who signed with their personal email. The course will be available for all government officials via common site.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@Katri:* I totally agree, that we have to ensure, NA terms are understood, but before that, to create a sensibility, that NA terms do not refer to the daily language usage

**Katri Soinne:**

*@Brenda:* Not yet, but we have been talking about a possibility to make the course in English, as well. At the moment it might be available in English in 2023?

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@Katri:* Your course is very interesting. Now the question would be, how to disseminate it. This should be also part of the issues here

**Daniel Suranyi:**

We should be careful that the different platforms developed by the sub teams stay also technically compatible, i.e. linking a certain chapters from the official handbook to the community presented before by Jim exchanging experience and sample data.

**Tihomira DIMOVA:**

The first step is to find user friendly terms in English, but then you have to find good equivalents in your national language.

**World Bank\_Catherine Van Rompaey:**

I think it is important to distinguish between communication aimed at users (which should focus on appropriate interpretation and use) and that aimed at compilers (which should focus on specific parameters and technical details required for appropriate measurement). Both are important and will necessarily take different forms.

**Finland Ville Tolkki:**

Could the digital manual -hub provide also a "quick" and more holistic picture of these systems. Such as in OECDs Understanding NA and FA are very good. Also for BoP.

**Uruguay\_Lourdes Erro:**

I agree with Tihomira. Even from the very beginning of the discussion of definitions and taxonomies, how to integrate the different languages used in the countries (not only in English)?

**Uruguay\_Lourdes Erro:**

I would like to congratulate the coordination effort of international organizations to arrive at harmonized manuals and a common digital platform to interact. That will be cost efficient for both compilers and users. In all TTs, but especially in this very challenging one.

**Peter Banhegyi, Hungary:**

Compilers usually face concrete, individual issues which are under confidentiality. Is it an issue for the hub to deal with individual cases?

**James Tebrake:**

Hi everyone, here is a summary of the questions related to the compilers hub:

1. It is commented that some of the good practices observed in this type of initiatives is to promote Wiki-type platforms, which facilitate exchange and technical discussions, as well as share, edit and comment on the material in real time.
2. In my experience there are also lots of misunderstandings between national accountants and our primary users, such as people involved in economic policy and research. Are there any ideas about better reaching out to them?
3. Will the Hub allow for private conversations since not everyone may be willing to speak openly
4. Do you see different hubs for each statistical domain or one hub covering all statistical domains.
5. Will there be different roles in the hub such as guest, member and administrator.
6. Is this not just a duplication of what is already out there.
7. What are you going to do about language – will the hub be multi-lingual

Hi everyone, below is a summary of the questions related to the digital manuals

1. It is considered that cross-navigation between manuals can provide a platform of a collaborative environment to support the statistical updating of economic issues, the exchange of information, innovative ideas and general knowledge between different user profiles (experts, professionals or the general public).
2. Are we moving towards joint text for the various standards?
3. Will all the international statistical standards, guides, handbooks etc become digital?
4. Do you expect to get rid of the print versions all together?
5. Do you think this will allow for a more agile update process?
6. Where will the manuals be located?
7. Will the digital manual be available before 2025 – i.e. will we digitalize the 2008 SNA

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

"user friendly" has to be defined: In my opinion, user friendly means, that any misunderstandings are avoided, not necessarily that the terms are known

"increase use of NA data" - the content of NA data is so complex, that the correct use will hardly increase by new terms

**Katri Soinne:**

I agree with Ligia - just starting to use terms which do have other meanings as well, is not "user friendly", it is just confusing.

**Daniel Suranyi:**

I would say what also fits into that area is how the data that is described in the manuals is bridged to real data, i.e. how the data models reflect the manuals. In SNA 2008 there have been several issues in that area, making it sometimes difficult to link the data back to the methodology. The most prominent example of course being the famous S2, which is simplified as a sector in SNA, even though it is of geographic nature. It makes it very difficult to model and understand globalisation data and country to country data. There are several more of those examples when you compare the manuals and the corresponding data models,

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@organizers:* It is a pity, that chat and author are speaking at the same time. It is NOT a good solution

**World Bank\_Catherine Van Rompaey:**

I believe many NSOs have already found ways to overcome the complexity of SNA terminology which can inhibit user understanding (in releases to the media, for example). We should have a look at best practices in this area as input to developing complementary terminology.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@Tihomira:* maybe chat session and then moderator takes over

**Argentina, Pedro Lines:**

I believe that we do not only have to develop a more user-friendly terminology to reach the user but this should be also complemented with intuitive infographics, illustrations and graphic schemes.

**Julio Santaella:**

I want to congratulate the TT on communication of NA for the great work been done. I would also suggest strengthening the partnership and coordination with the dissemination department of the NSOs in order to enhance the appropriate use and exploitation of all the enormous wealth of information in the SNA (beyond headline GDP).

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

Different publications in different countries: this isn't necessarily bad: e.g. where would you look for a mousetrap in different countries? In German you would look and find under housewares, in Japan - as - I was said - under weapons

**World Bank\_Catherine Van Rompaey:**

I agree effective visualization tools have great potential to make statistics more accessible to a broader audience.

**Uruguay\_Lourdes Erro:**

Agree, Pedro & Catherine. Mostly thinking about new generations, they are more image-dependent in the way of understanding the world

**Peter van de Ven:**

Please stop using the term "revisions"! I would prefer, as already suggested before by others as well, the term "updates", as it does not have the negative connotation with adjusting mistakes.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

I suggest to use "revisions" for major revisions and updates for routine updating data

**Peter van de Ven:**

For major revisions, one could also use the term "benchmark updates". When it concerns a change in the international standards, one could think of e.g. "alignment to the 2025 SNA".

**Rodolfo OCDE:**

is there going to be a certifying body? How is this going to work?

**Argentina, Pedro Lines:**

I believe that the new tools to monitor the implementation of the standards should be completely aligned with GSBPM and GSIM.

**Uruguay\_Lourdes Erro:**

This alignment topic is very relevant, yet very challenging. Having adopted the 2008 SNA does not necessarily mean the same as accuracy.

**Katri Soinne:**

The visualization needs good and interesting data, and you can really mislead users, either on purpose or by accidents, with graphs etc.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

@Peter: Terminology, user-friendly: Updates means usually taking new data in a dataset, to make something -up to date" not to change concepts and definitions .

**Christopher Sibley:**

Should also think how our terminology works with social media, so we can engage directly with users better.

**Peter van de Ven:**

@Ligia: That's why I don't suggest the term "updates" for a change in standards!

**Michael Smedes:**

Would the framework also consider the reason for any divergence? For example, deliberate deviation to reflect country specific situation vs inability (lack of data source etc) to measure in line with standards?

**Peter van de Ven:**

The term "investment" doesn't work, as it can also refer to investments in financial assets, so you would to be more precise.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

*@Peter:* No updates, ok, but "NA for Germany - alignment to SNA 2008 " is a little strange here. "NA Revision according to SNA 2008 " would anyone understand

**Andrey Kosarev:**

Example of GFCF vs. "investment"

**Peter van de Ven:**

*@Michael:* It should be bloody good reasons! :)

**UNSD-Benson Sim:**

We have to understand why sometimes newspaper articles do not use terms like gross fixed capital formation. One reason is to reduce the number of words in the article. That is why they end up using investment.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

When you say investment would a lot of users thing of investment in companies bookkeeping, which is different form NA definition of GFCF

**World Bank\_Catherine Van Rompaey:**

Media are generally aimed at the general public. General public will not understand GFCF....

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

SNA is a set of definitions. Economic statistics may means a lot, but no one would be able to find the definition of GFCF with such a reference

**Andrey Kosarev:**

GFCF vs. "investment" - doesn't look like a problem, my experience would show examples that many users do understand GFCF term

**Peter Banhegyi, Hungary:**

Just an add: the term "revision" is international and usable in many languages, but the term "update" is not, a new properly term should be found for this purpose. It may not be an easy task.

**Argentina, Pedro Lines:**

I suggest to use the SNA codes (like P5g) and then that each country use the description that consider more suitable to reach their user. Using the SNA code together with the description (user friendly), we make sure that we are close the SNA concepts.

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

Andrey: I agree

**Francisco Guillén:**

Congratulations for this great TT work, however one important thing to the compilers of National Accountants is to give transparency in its process on compilation, Methodological soundness,, quality results and communication; for that we believe that the definition and alignment between DQAF and GSBPM is important. Could you give some idea about some good practices to adopt those tools for NA?

**Germany Ligia Luetticken:**

@Pedro: good idea!

**Peter van de Ven:**

On the point of accuracy, I fully agree. Looking at it from an international comparability perspective, it may often be more important to have a recent benchmark than to have implemented the details of latest international standards.

**UNECE Rami Peltola:**

You may find the following UNECE Guides on Making Data Meaningful (Parts 1-4) useful:

<http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=17566>

<http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=17568>

<http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=17574>

<http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=34524>

Parts 1 and 2 are also available in Russian, Spanish and Croatian

**James Tebrake:**

To summarize for the UNECE and the TT attached are some of the questions and comments pulled out of the chat:

in order to enhance the appropriate use and exploitation of all the enormous wealth of information in the SNA (beyond headline GDP).

14. Please stop using the term "revisions"! I would prefer, as already suggested before by others as well, the term "updates", as it does not have the negative connotation with adjusting mistakes.

15. I suggest using the SNA codes (like P5g) and then that each country use the description that consider more suitable to reach their user. Using the SNA code together with the description (user friendly), we make sure that we are close the SNA concepts.

16. Congratulations for this great TT work, however one important thing to the compilers of National Accountants is to give transparency in its process on compilation, Methodological soundness, quality results and communication; for that we believe that the definition and alignment between DQAF and GSBPM is important. Could you give some idea about some good practices to adopt those tools for NA?

Summary of questions and comments and questions related to the alignment of the standards

It is considered that the review can shed light on the degree of implementation and alignment with international standards, considering the evolution of national accounts.

2. Sometimes countries are criticized for not implementing the 2008 SNA because they may not produce estimates of FISIM or capitalized R&D even though output in these areas is negligible. Will the new recommendations related to alignment take significant into account?
3. I believe that the new tools to monitor the implementation of the standards should be completely aligned with GSBPM and GSIM.
4. is there going to be a certifying body? how is this going to work?
5. This alignment topic is very relevant, yet very challenging. Having adopted the 2008 SNA does not necessarily mean the same as accuracy.
6. Would the framework also consider the reason for any divergence? For example, deliberate deviation to reflect country specific situation vs inability (lack of data source etc) to measure in line with standards?

Summary of the questions and comments related to taxonomy:

1. It is considered that the process can support the strengthening of transparency by communicating issues such as data reviews, and promote harmonized terminology for use by NSOs, international organizations and promote comparability between countries.
2. Everyone's process is slightly different – do you think it is possible to develop a single taxonomy?
3. Are you thinking about just aligning terms and taxonomy or are you going to recommend a process everyone follows.
4. "user friendly" has to be defined: In my opinion, user friendly means, that any misunderstandings are avoided, not necessarily that the terms are known

**Martha Tovar:**

*@Pedro Lines:* In producing national figures the macroeconomic interpretation is important, in producing regional and global figures harmonization is important, national classifications should be reconciliated with any guideline

**ONS, UK Rob Kent-Smith:**

Other point I would add is to consider the range of users that we have, maybe different layers of complexity in terminology is needed for different typologies of user

**Peter Banhegyi, Hungary:**

Finding adequate terms for the public is a difficult task because many people are not educated in economics by schools and universities. So education is important but to whom is it necessary? Everybody cannot get personal education to understand well sophisticated terms. The role of media as a medium is essential here. They should interpret data well.

**Michael Smedes:**

*@Peter:* I'm sure the reasons will be excellent! But seriously it might be useful to the ongoing development of standards to understand what implementations are not seen as important in some countries, what implementations just aren't feasible for countries etc. Framework should also inform international activities for assisting countries in implementation.



**Peter van de Ven:**

*@Michael:* I fully share your views.

**Martha Tovar:**

*@Michael Smedes:* Totally agree, scarcity and weaknesses of basic data is a challenge

**Katri Soinne:**

The concepts "national" and "domestic" do not have clear difference in Finnish. We used to talk about "household consumption in Finland" (as domestic) and "consumption of Finnish households" (as national), but unfortunately these concepts are not in alignments with SNA 2008 / EA 2010, and those have been changed to "household consumption (D)" and "household consumption (N)"?

**UNSD-Benson Sim:**

Sharing <http://aria.stats.govt.nz/aria/>, a tool built by Stats New Zealand to find and download concepts and definitions, classifications, concordances, and standards used for data and statistical activities across government. It may be useful for the work on digitally-enabled and interactive statistical standards.