

## **Communication**

### **OECD, Jorrit Zwijnenburg:**

A question in relation to the first presentation: I am curious about the exact distinction between provisional and experimental estimates. I assume the latter term is also proposed when there is not yet a lot of experience yet in compiling certain results (although they are within the existing boundaries), such as distributional national accounts' results., correct?

### **South Africa, Barend de Beer:**

Very good idea - more harmonisation within possibilities will just benefit the overall efforts to a more harmonised statistical product offering

### **USA, Robert\_Kornfeld:**

I like many of these suggestions and hope this work continues. I suspect another key reason why people don't relate to many national accounts terms is a distributional issue- people hear GDP growth but many don't feel better off. More distributional statistics would help here.

### **ECB, Stanimira Kosekova:**

From user point of view, the distinction between official and provisional estimates is not very clear, both are official statistics. Perhaps consulting data flagging in the sdmx standard could be useful. It is very welcome to point quantitative estimates on the various factors on revisions, often might not be possible for the compilers thought as the factors might be mixed.

### **National Bank of Belgium, Catherine Rigo:**

Distributional aspects are more and more important: people do not understand how statisticians can say that (part of) the population save more and more when a larger of it has problems to face current expenditure. This is a crucial point of credibility.

### **OECD, John Mitchell:**

No need to take the floor. But how do we know if we have been successful? Survey the same 130 people in Manchester & Birmingham. It's a lot of work to make sure that we make a meaningful difference. How do we stop us being the judge of our own work?

### **UNECE, Tihomira Dimova:**

I like the idea of standardizing revisions, but it could be tricky to make the distinction e.g. a methodological improvement may also include improving in data sources.

### **UK-ONS, Richard Heys:**

I worry about the phrase 'experimental' - as this could cover early work which will go into an 'official statistic' or a piece of work which is a one-off end in itself. How do we differentiate something which will continue to evolve from one-off analyses?

### **UN SIAP, Pinar Ucar:**

Thank you for the sharing results from public understanding survey. I would also like to hear the results for age groups not only on gender.

**Statistics Finland, Katri Soinne:**

No need to take the floor: I agree with Arkady - having specific terms has its point, while using terms which are used also in "everyday life", might just add confusion, not help?

**USA, Marshall Reinsdorf:**

Agree that technical terms help with precision. but there's still be some room for improving understandability. Even sophisticated users don't understand some terms like "balance of primary incomes".

**Germany, Albert Braakmann:**

Marshall, I agree

**Hungary, Péter Bánhegyi:**

No need to take the floor, just a short question. This hub seems to be very exciting and helpful. A compiler's work, however, often contains confidential data and information. How can this hub be used in the case of confidentiality - i.e. will it serve also as a direct data exchange platform or a forum only for general conceptual and communication issues?

**Japan, Hide Ishibashi:**

No need to take the floor. We appreciate AfDB colleague's excellent contribution. Proposed evaluation framework may be helpful, but further consideration may be welcomed, especially on the category name such as "fully" align, threshold values etc. And be careful on the administrative burden of each country. Complicated evaluation framework may discourage each country's effort to reply.

**UK-ONS, Richard Heys:**

Happy not to take the floor. Can we include international comparability of labour metrics aligned with national accounts - to allow good comparisons of productivity measures?

**South Africa, Barend de Beer:**

I cannot emphasise enough the importance of international methodological cooperation - and in that regard the compilers hub approach presented by James is very positive development - on broad conceptual matters but also on technical issues where you might want to test your approach against a multilateral set of your peers in the statistics compilation environment.

**USA, Robert Kornfeld:**

I really like the IMF plan for sharing information - how does the information compare with similar sharing of information on the OECD web site?