



Value added in exports: Accounting for processing trade

William Powers

United States International Trade Commission

March 14, 2012

The views expressed here are solely those of the presenter. This presentation is not meant to represent the views of the USITC or any of its Commissioners.



Presentation outline

- Extent of processing trade in Latin America
- Adjusting for processing trade when calculating domestic and foreign value added in exports is important
 - How much does this change the results for Mexico?
 - What factors are causing the difference?
- What can you do if you don't have a processing IO table?
 - What's the process of estimating such a table?
 - How accurate is it likely to be?



Processing trade is pervasive in the world and in Latin America

- Processing trade accounts for 18% of global developing-country exports (Maurer and Degain, 2010)
- Important to trade (and sometimes employment) in Latin America

Country	EPZ share of employment		EPZ share of exports	
	2002	2002	2002	2006
Brazil	0.1	—	—	—
Colombia	0.1	9.3	40	40
Costa Rica	2.1	50	52	52
Dominican Republic	5.5	80	80	80
El Salvador	2.9	—	—	—
Haiti	—	50	50	50
Honduras	4.7	—	—	—
Jamaica	1.9	—	—	—
Mexico	3.5	92	85	85
Panama	1.4	—	—	—
Venezuela	0.6	—	—	—
Source: Milberg (2007); De La Cruz et al. (2011)				



Accounting for processing trade when calculating foreign content in exports

- Standard assumption: production for exports uses the same share of foreign inputs as production for domestic use
- But with processing trade, foreign content can be much higher in exports
- Adjustment dramatically improves level and trends of estimates
- Adjustment avoids overstating value of exports to domestic economy

Foreign value added in Mexican manufacturing exports (%)

	Unadjusted HIY method			Adjusted for processing exports		
	2000	2003	2006	2000	2003	2006
Foreign value added	46.9	46.6	46.3	70.0	66.2	63.8

Adjusted estimate is **upper bound**; processing includes Maquila and PITEX trade.
Source: De La Cruz, Koopman, and Wang, 2011, using 2003 benchmark processing IO table produced by INEGI.



Why do the two estimates differ?

- Three main factors
 - Imported intermediate inputs used in processing vs. normal exports
 - Share of processing exports in total exports
 - Sector composition of exports from processing vs. normal exports
- Effects of these factors change over time
- Can't use a simple rule of thumb to estimate the correct amount of foreign content in exports



What can you do if you don't have a processing IO table for your country?

- Combine standard IO table with detailed processing trade statistics
 - Imports of intermediates used by processing regime in each sector
 - Exports produced by processing regime in each sector
- Use constrained optimization to populate IO coefficients subject to IO accounting identities
- Some coefficients constrained to zero



Example: China

Foreign value added in Chinese manufacturing exports (%)

	Unadjusted HIY method			Adjusted, estimate		
	2000	2003	2006	2000	2003	2006
Foreign value added	46.9	46.6	46.3	54.5	52.4	52.5

Source: Koopman, Wang, and Wei, 2008

- How accurate are the resulting value-added estimates?
Depends on what you're looking at:
 - National estimates very close to true values ($\pm 1-2\%$)
 - Sectoral estimates highly correlated with true values, but vary much more: differences of 15% or more are common



Questions/Comments?

- Contact information
 - Bill Powers
 - Research Division, Office of Economics
 - U.S. International Trade Commission
 - william.powers@usitc.gov
- Sources
 - De La Cruz, Koopman, and Wang, 2011, “Estimating foreign value added in Mexico’s manufacturing exports,” www.usitc.gov/publications/332/EC201104A.pdf
 - Koopman, Wang, and Wei, 2008, “How much of Chinese exports is really made in China?,” www.nber.org/papers/w14109.pdf