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## 1. Introduction

In 1986 Foreign Trade Division considered several alternatives for controlling the increasing workload and costs associated with preprocessing and keying operations on the import and export data in Jeffersonville. Among the potential solutions considered were (1) sampling Shipper's Export Declarations (SEDs) with line item values between the reporting exemption level and a specified cutoff value and (2) increasing the reporting exemption level for export shipments from its level of $\$ 1000$ at that time to some larger value. The effect of the first alternative on the detailed export series in terms of projected number of series no longer published in a particular month is described in a memorandum from Gbur to Walter ("Feasibility of Sampling SEDs under \$2500", dated Sept. 10, 1986). Since the potential effect is so devastating, especially for the commodity by country by district by mode of transportation series published in EM522, it was decided instead to increase the reporting exemption level for exports.

The export exemption level was increased from $\$ 1000$ to \$1500. Processing changes were implemented in january 1987 and regulatory changes will become effective on July 1, 1987. A memorandum from Puzzilla to Adams ("Proposal to Raise the Export Exemption Level to $\$ 1500^{\prime \prime}$, dated Oct. 31 , 1986) gives estimates of the workload and cost savings and the impact on the aggregate export series. Additional information can be found in a memorandum from Dickerson to Walter ("Impact of Raising Export Exemption Level to $\$ 1500$ - Supplement to Oct. 31 Memorandum", dated Nov. 6, 1986).

This report presents the results of a more detailed study of the effect of raising the exemption level from $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$. A draft of the summary for use in the text of export publications can be found in a memorandum from Gbur to Walter ("The Effect of Increasing the Export Reporting Exemption Level", dated Feb. 19, 1987) and has been reproduced as Appendix 1 of this report. The draft text which will be published as an announcement attached to
the publications for the March 1987 export statistics can be found in Appendix 2.

Section 2 of this report contains the details of our analysis. An overall summary and conclusions are given in Section 3.

## 2. An Analysis is of the Effect of Increasing the Export Exemption Level

Four months of 1986 data were used to evaluate the effect of increasing the reporting exemption level from the $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$; March, June, September, and December. These months were chosen - to provide insight into the month to month variability of the effect on the export statistics and to provide a gross indication of any time differences in the effect. In each study month, the total value of shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ was computed for each export series and compared to the corresponding value of all shipments for that series. Analyses of these percentages were carried out.

Summary data files at the seven digit commodity by country by mode of transportation (MOT) levels were constructed by Ron Catzva (FTD) for March, September, and December. Two files obtained from Dave Dickerson (FTD) combined to form the June data file. Domestic and foreign export data were combined. Shipments to Puerto Rico and U.S. possessions were deleted. Computations were carried out on the Univac using a combination of FORTRAN and Minitab programs. The latter is a statistical package.

Three factors were used to define the classes of export series analyzed in this study; commodity code, country code, and MOT. In addition to total exports and the three classes of series defined above, all possible combinations of the factors were used to construct sets of series. The four additional classes are defined by commodity ( 4 digit) by country, commodity (4 digit) by MOT, country by MOT, and commodity (7 digit) by country by MOT. Only Schedule E commodity codes were utilized in the analysis. They were chosen instead of Schedule B since they are used in FT900, FT990, and the majority of the export
publications. At the seven digit level there is a one to one correspondence between the two schedules so that the effect in publications such as EM522 which contain detailed series using Schedule B codes can be assessed.

In this report the term "shipment" will be defined as a line item on a potentially multi-line SED. The term "low value shipment" will be taken to mean a shipment between the old exemption level of $\$ 1000$ and the new level of $\$ 1500$. The rationale for this definition is that such a shipment is among the smallest in value for which information was collected. In the study months it represents that portion of the originally reported data which would have been excluded from the tabulations if the new exemption level rather than the old had been in force. This differs from the usage of the term found in the text of the export publications where it refers to shipments under $\$ 1000$ for which no information is available. Rather than introduce a new term for this segment of what will become the entire set of low value shipments under the new exemption level, we have decided to abuse the current terminology. If the distinction is kept in mind, no confusion should result.

### 2.1. Total Exports

The effect of the increase in the exemption level on the total export series in the four study months is summarized in Table 1. Although there is some monthly variation, the effect, both in terms of dollar value and low value as a percentage of the total value, is small. There are no apparent time trends. Over the four study months low value shipments totalled $\$ 461.7$ million. Extrapolation would yield an estimated annual loss of approximately $\$ 1.39$ billion.

Using May 1986 data, the Puzzilla to Adams memorandum estimated that approximately 75,000 SEDs would be eliminated from the processing cycle each month. This represents approximately $13 \%$ of all SEDS. The effect of the increase in the exemption level in terms of line items is given in Table 2 for three study
months. The June data file as constructed did not contain the necessary line item counts to be included in the table. The line item results in Table 2 agree closely with those for SEDs in the Puzzilla memorandum.

Table 1. Effect of the Increase in the Exemption Level on the Value of Total Exports


### 2.2. Country Level Export Series

The percentage of the total value of exports consisting of low value shipments was calculated by country for each study month. The distributions of these low value percentages by month are summarized in Table 3. These monthly distributions are skewed to the right with median percentages ranging from $0.5 \%$ to $0.6 \%$. There is very little variation in the overall shape of the distribution from month to month.

Approximately $98 \%$ of the countries each month had less than $5 \%$ of their total value of exports made up of low value shipments. Countries with more than $5 \%$ of their total formed from low value shipments are listed in Table 4. These series accounted for a total of only $\$ 8.1$ million, or approximately $0.1 \%$

Table 3. Summary of the Monthly Distributions of Low Value Percentage of Country Series

|  | March | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Study } \\ & \text { June } \end{aligned}$ | Month Sept. | Dec. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of countries | 164 | 161 | 163 | 161 |
| Number with 0\% low value | 13 | 17 | 14 | 15 |
| Number with $100 \%$ low value | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Lower quartile | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% |
| Median | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% |
| Upper quartile | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% |
| Largest percentage | 31.0\%* | 33.1\%* | 7.9\% | 14.2\% |

Table 4. Countries with Low Value Percentages
Greater Than 5\%

| Study Month | Country <br> Code | Country | Total <br> value* | Percent <br> Low Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| March | 244 | Cayman Istands | \$6.54 | 5.1\% |
|  | 574 | Mongolia | m | 100.0\% |
|  | 780 | Seychelles | $\frac{\$ 0.03}{\$ 6.57}$ | 31.0\% |
| June | 243 | Turks and Caicos Is. | \$0.82 | 8. $4 \%$ |
|  | 481 | Albania | j 1 | 100.0\% |
|  | 767 | Burundi | \$0.03 | 5.3\% |
|  | 778 | Uganda | \$0.04 | 6.3\% |
|  | 790 | Fr. Indian Ocean Areas | j2 | 33.1\% |
|  |  |  | \$0.90 |  |
| Sept. | 317 | Fr. Guiana | \$0.33 | 7. $2 \%$ |
|  | 536 | Nepal | \$0.13 | 5.5\% |
|  | 780 | Seychelles | \$0.03 | 7.9\% |
|  |  |  | \$0.49 |  |
| Dec. | 239 | Cuba | \$0.04 | 7. $2 \%$ |
|  | 797 | Malawi | \$0.05 | 14.2\% |
|  |  |  | \$0.09 |  |

[^0]of total exports in the four study months. Two instances were encountered in which all shipments were low valued. This occured in March for Mongolia (one shipment valued at \$1154) and in June for Albania (one shipment valued at \$1412). Thus, it is possible for countries which would have been tabulated under the old exemption level to no longer be included in the tabulations based on the new exemption level. This appears to occur infrequently and in situations in which very little trade is involved. However, regardless of their relative unimportance, the disappearance of series in a given month at this level of aggregation is disturbing and should be carefully monitored if future increases in exemption levels are contemplated.

Estimates of the within country variability over time were obtained from the available monthly low value percentages for each country. The country means over the study months ranged from $0 \%$ to $11.7 \%$, with a median of $0.6 \%$. As with the monthly distributions, the distribution of the mean percentage is skewed to the right. A plot of the country means is shown in figure 1 , where rectangles have been added to emphasize the differences in variation at the one digit level. From the figure, percentages for Asia (500's) tend to be small while those for Central America (200's) and Africa (700's) tend to be slightly larger and more variable.

The median standard deviation of the country samples was $0.18 \%$ with upper and lower quartiles of $0.48 \%$ and $0.08 \%$, respectively. Thus, except for the effect of the occasional outiiers listed in Table 4, there is relatively little within country variation in the low value percentages over time.

### 2.3. Schedule E Commodity Export Series

The seven digit Schedule $E$ commodity series were aggregated to the four digit level and low value percentages were calculated. The distributions of these percentages for each study month are summarized in Table 5. The monthly distributions are skewed to the right with median percentages of approximately $0.75 \%$. There is very little difference in the distributions from month to month. A

Figure 1.
Plot of the Mean Low Value Percentages for the Country Level Series

comparison of Tables 3 and 5 shows that the country and commodity distributions have roughly the same right skewed shape but that the commodity series have somewhat longer upper tails.

In each study month more than $99 \%$ of the commodity series had less than $10 \%$ of their total consisting of low value shipments. Series with low value percentages greater than $10 \%$ are listed in Table 6. They account for a total of only $\$ 12.1$ million dollars in the four study months, representing less than $0.2 \%$ of the total value of exports in these months. The majority of the series in Table 6 are food and live animal series (Section 0). As with the country level series, examples occur in which all shipments in a series for a particular month fall between the old and new exemption level and would have appeared under the old exemption level but not under the new one.

Estimates of within commodity series variation were obtained from the available monthly low value percentages. The mean percentages are plotted against the commodity code in Figure 2. From the graph we see that the range of mean percentages depends on the commodity type. As a group, Section 3 (mineral fuels and lubricants) series have the smallest low value percentages while Section (food and live animals) series have more variable percentages. The median commodity series mean was $0.79 \%$ with upper and lower quartiles of $1.66 \%$ and $0.24 \%$, respectively. The median standard deviation was $0.18 \%$ with upper and lower quartiles of $0.43 \%$ and $0.06 \%$, respectively. As was the case with the country level series, there is relatively little within commodity series variation in the low value percentages over time.

### 2.4. Mode of Transportation Level Series

Although mode of transportation series are not published by themselves, they do provide some insight into the differential effect of the increase in the exemption level on the three major MOT categories. Table 7 summarizes the results for dollar values and Table 8 provides similar information for line item counts.

## Table 5. Summary of the Monthly Distributions of Low Value Percentages for 4-digit Schedule E Commodity Series




Figure 2.
Plot of the Mean Low Value Percentages for Schedule E Commodity Codes


Table 7. Effect of the Increase in the Exemption Level by Mode of Transportation

Study Month
March June Sept. Dec.


Table 8. Effect of the Increase in the Exemption Level on the Number of Line Items Processed

Study Month<br>Sept. Dec.

Total items
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Vessel } & 170,862 & 146,843 \\ 150,450\end{array}$
Other 243,357
273,551 264,345
Air 321,264
299,153 293,588
Low value items
Vessel 12,380
10,491 10,155
Other
36,263
42,281 39,139
Air
49,801
46,012
44,712
Percent low value
Vessel 7.3\%
0ther
15.0\%

| $7.1 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $15.5 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ |
| $15.4 \%$ | $15.2 \%$ |

Distribution of low value items over MOT

| Vesse1 | $12.6 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Other | $36.8 \%$ |

10.6\%
$10.8 \%$
Other
36.8\%
42. $8 \%$
41.6\%

Air
50.6\%
46.6\%
47.6\%

From Table 7, the value of air shipments are the most affected of the three MOT; but even for air shipments low value exports accounted for only a small portion (no more than $1.2 \%$ ) of the total value. The last panel of the table demonstrates our conclusion that air shipment values are affected the most; approximately half of the dollar value of low value exports in each study month was from air shipments. In contrast, the effect on vessel shipments was much smaller.

As before, line item counts for June were not available on our data file. For each of the three remaining study months, approximately $15 \%$ of the line items for air and other MOT would not have been processed under the new exemption level. Slightly less than half of that percentage would have been eliminated for vessel shipments. As expected, the line item distribution over the MOT categories in Table 8 agrees closely with that of the dollar value distribution in Table 7 since the range of values for low value shipments is relatively small.

### 2.5. Schedule E Commodity by Country Series

Low value percentages were computed for the approximately 26000 four digit Sehedule $E$ commodity by country series in each study month. The distributions of these percentages are presented in Table 9 and some summary statistics are given in Table 10.

From Table 10, in each study month more than half of the series contained no low value shipments and thus would not have been affected by the increase in the exemption level. At the other extreme, approximately 1200 series per month were composed entirely of $l$ ow value shipments and would have been published under the old exemption level but not under the new level. This represents an average of $4.6 \%$ of the series in this class with a total value of approximately $\$ 1.7$ million dollars per month.

In Table 11 the $100 \%$ low value series are cross-classified by their one digit commodity and country codes. The distributions of the dollar values of these series are shown in Table 12.

## Table 9. Distributions of the Percentage of Low Value Shipments for Commodity by Country Series

| Interval |  | March |  |  | June |  |  | September |  |  | December |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Count | Dist | CumDist | Count | Dist | CumDist | Count | Dist | CumDist | Count | Dist | Cundist |
| 0 | 5 | 22292 | . 8346 | .8346 | 21851 | . 8293 | . 8293 | 21412 | . 8345 | . 8345 | 21881 | . 8440 | . 8440 |
| 5 | 10 | 1375 | . 0515 | .8861 | 1381 | . 0524 | .8817 | 12.53 | . 0488 | .8834 | 1262 | . 0487 | . 8927 |
| 10 | 15 | 582 | . 0218 | . 9079 | 609 | . 0231 | . 9048 | 593 | . 0231 | . 9065 | 503 | . 0194 | . 9121 |
| 15 | 20 | 343 | .0128 | . 9207 | 382 | .0145 | . 9193 | 355 | .0138 | . 9203 | 325 | . 0125 | . 9247 |
| 20 | 25 | 246 | .0092 | . 9299 | 233 | .0088 | . 9282 | 233 | .0091 | . 9294 | 238 | . 0092 | . 9338 |
| 25 | 30 | 176 | .0066 | .9365 | 166 | .0063 | . 9345 | 163 | .0064 | . 9358 | 137 | .0053 | . 9391 |
| 30 | 35 | 131 | .0049 | . 9414 | 130 | .0049 | . 9394 | 135 | .0053 | . 9410 | 122 | .0047 | . 9438 |
| 35 | 40 | 123 | .0046 | . 9460 | 131 | .0050 | . 9444 | 134 | . 0052 | . 9463 | 136 | .0052 | . 9491 |
| 40 | 45 | 96 | .0036 | . 9496 | 88 | .0033 | . 9477 | 93 | .0036 | . 9499 | 73 | . 0028 | . 9519 |
| 45 | 50 | 44 | .0016 | . .9513 | 45 | .0017 | . 9494 | 41 | .0016 | . 9515 | 50 | . 0019 | . 9538 |
| 50 | 55 | 15 | .0006 | . 9519 | 23 | .0009 | . 9503 | 22 | .0009 | . 9523 | 20 | . 0008 | . 9546 |
| 55 | 60 | 24 | .0009 | .9527 | 30 | .0011 | . 9514 | 32 | .0012 | . 9536 | 18 | .0007 | . 9553 |
| 60 | 65 | 18 | .0007 | . 9534 | 13 | .0005 | . 9519 | 9 | .0004 | . 9539 | 16 | .0006 | . 9559 |
| 65 | 70 | 8 | .0003 | . 0537 | 6 | .0002 | .9521 | 11 | . 0004 | . 9544 | 7 | . 0003 | . 9562 |
| 70 | 75 | 0 | .0000 | .9537 | 5 | .0002 | . 9523 | 2 | .0001 | . 9544 | 5 | .0002 | . 9564 |
| 75 | 80 | 5 | .0002 | . 9539 | 1 | .0000 | . 9524 | 3 | .0001 | .9546 | 3 | .0001 | . 9563 |
| 80 | 85 | 1 | .0000 | . 9539 | 1 | .0000 | . 9524 | 2 | .0001 | . 9546 | 1 | . 0000 | . 9565 |
| 85 | 90 | 0 | .0000 | . 9539 | 0 | .0000 | . 9524 | 1 | .0000 | . 9547 | 0 | .0000 | . 9565 |
| 90 | 95 | 0 | .0000 | . 9539 | 0 | .0000 | . 9524 | 0 | .0000 | . 9547 | 1 | .0000 | . 9566 |
| 95 | 100 | 0 | .0000 | . 9539 | 0 | .0000 | . 9524 | 0 | . 0000 | $.0547$ | 1120 | . 0000 | $.9566$ |
| 100 |  | 1230 | .0461 | 1.0000 | 1254 | .0476 | 1.0000 | 1163 | .0453 | 1.0000 | 1126 | .0434 | 1.0000 |

## Table 10. Summary Statistics for the Schedule E Commodity by Country Series

Study Month

|  | March | June | Sept. | Dec. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of series | 26709 | 26349 | 25657 | 25924 |
| Number with 0\% low value | 15233 | 14989 | 14872 | 15146 |
| Number with 100\% low value | 1230 | 1254 | 1163 | 1126 |
| Percent with 0\% low value | $57.0 \%$ | $56.9 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ | $58.4 \%$ |
| Percent with $100 \%$ low value | $4.6 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |

Approximately one-half of these series have commodity codes from Sections 5 (Chemicals and related products) and 6 (Manufactured goods classified chiefly by material). Section 7
(Machinery and transport equipment) had the largest number of series among the remaining sections. Several sections were only minimally affected each month. Series involving exports to Central America (country code 2) accounted for slightly less then onefourth of such series. Series involving shipments to North America (primarily Canada) were affected the least.

### 2.6. Country by Mode of Transportation series

Low value percentages were calculated for each country by mode of transportation. Summary results are presented in Table 13. In general the value of low value shipments relative to the total value was small. Series for modes of transportation other than air or vessel were affected the least while air shipment series were affected the most. However, for the overwhelming majority of the series in each MOT category, less than $5 \%$ of the total consisted of low value shipments. The unusually low entries in the first two panels of Table 13 for other MOT in June appears to be related to an unusually small number of countries having exports by this MOT; 96 countries in June as compared to 148 , 147 , and 150 , respectively, in the other three study months. An average of four series per month consisted entirely of low value shipments. Their combined value was negligible.

Table 11. Distributions of the $100 \%$ Low Value

## Distribution of the 1008 low value conodity by country series as at porcentage of ell $100 \%$ lou value serieat for march

| Countzy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cemmodity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Sotal |
| 0 | . 00 | 4.63 | .73 | 1.38 | 1.38 | 1.30 | . 73 | 10.16 |
| 1 | . 00 | . 33 | . 16 | . 16 | . 16 | . 24 | .08 | 1.14 |
| 2 | . 08 | 1.22 | . 57 | 1.38 | . 19 | .31 | .73 | 5.20 |
| 3 | 100 | . 33 | . 00 | . 16 | .61 | . 00 | .08 | . 98 |
| 4 | . 08 | . 24 | . 08 | . 24 | . 24 | .00 | .08 | . 98 |
| 5 | .00 | 3.17 | .73 | 2.68 | 2.44 | .73 | 1.63 | 11.38 |
| 6 | .00 | 7.07 | 3.25 | 5.85 | 4.47 | 1.30 | 1.01 | 24.96 |
| 7 | . 00 | 5.71 | 3.25 | 4.31 | 5.20 | 2.36 | 7.07 | 27.97 |
| 8 | . 09 | 4.47 | 2.03 | 2.85 | 3.51 | . 89 | 2.85 | 16.67 |
| 9 | .00 | .33 | . 000 | 2.00 | . 08 | .88 | . 68 | 16. 87 |
| Total | . 16 | 87.56 | 10.81 | 19.02 | 18.66 | 7.24 | 16.34 | 100.00 |

Distribution of the 1008 lou valut comodity by country sezies as a percentage of all $100 \times$ lou value series for sume

| Country |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commodity | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Total |
| 0 | . 00 | 3.67 | . 88 | 1.04 | 1.28 | . 86 | . 64 | 4.21 |
| 1 | .00 | $.48$ | .24 | . 08 | . 32 | .00 | .16 | 1.25 |
| 2 | , 08 | 1.59 | . 64 | 1.44 | 1.12 | . 48 | . 56 | 5.98 |
| 3 | .00 | . 24 | . 08 | . 08 | . 45 | . 00 | .00 | -88 |
| 4 | .00 | . 32 | . 06 | . 24 | . 08 | .00 | .00 | . 72 |
| 5 | .00 | 3.43 | 1.12 | 1.59 | 2.31 | .48 | 2.07 | 11.00 |
| 6 | . 08 | 7.66 | 3.67 | 5.90 | 6.22 | 1.83 | 3.59 | 28.95 |
| 7 | .00 | 5.34 | 3.19 | 3.67 | 5.34 | 1.59 | 5.42 | 24.56 |
| - | 90 | 4.39 | 2.47 | 4.55 | 3.03 | . 38 | 2.55 | 17.86 |
| 9 | 100 | . 16 | . 08 | . 16 | . 24 | . 08 | . 08 | . 80 |
| Total | . 16 | 27.27 | 12.44 | 18.74 | 20.41 | 3.90 | 13.07 | 100.00 |

Distribution of the $100 x$ lom value conodity by country series as percentage of all $100 \%$ low value gerite for Septenber

|  |  |  |  | Count |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ceamodity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Sotal |
| 0 | . 00 | 3.96 | 1.20 | 1.72 | 2. 53 | 1.29 | . 69 | 10.66 |
| 1 | . 00 | . 34 | . 09 | .43 | . 52 | . 17 | .00 | 1.35 |
| 2 | .00 | 1.35 | . 17 | .71 | 1.03 | . 60 | .60 | 4.73 |
| 3 | . 00 | . 26 | . 09 | .09 | . 17 | .00 | .26 | . 86 |
| 4 | .00 | . 26 | . 17 | .00 | . 26 | .00 | .09 | .77 |
| 3 | .00 | 2.49 | 1.20 | 1.72 | 2.58 | .82 | 1.89 | 10.46 |
| 6 | . 69 | 0.25 | 3.44 | 5.76 | 5.85 | 1.46 | 2.49 | 27.34 |
| 7 | .00 | 7.05 | 2.67 | - 04 | 5.13 | 1.85 | 4. 89 | 25.97 |
| 8 | .00 | 5.07 | 1.11 | 1. 18 | 3.46 | .86 | 2.06 | 16.94 |
| 9 | .00 | .09 | .09 | . 26 | . 09 | .09 | . 43 | 1.83 |
| Total | .09 | 29.32 | 10.92 | 17.97 | 81.32 | 6.88 | 13.30 | 100.06 |

## Distribution of the $100 \%$ lou value comedity by country sezies as a percentage of all ioos lou value seftes for geterber

| countzy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cemmodity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Total |
| 0 | . 06 | 3.46 | .80 | 1.42 | 1.78 | 1.18 | . 44 | 9. 15 |
| 1 | . 00 | . 89 | .00 | . 00 | .11 | . 00 | .18 | 1.24 |
| 2 | -18 | 1.69 | . 8 | 1.42 | 1.13 | .80 | .62 | 7.02 |
| 4 | . 00 | . 18 | .09 | . 00 | . 18 | $.09^{\circ}$ | .88 | .62 |
| 5 | .00 | 2.31 | .18 | 2.88 | 2. 28 |  | 1.79 | 10.94 |
| 6 | . 00 | 6.48 | 3.02 | 6.11 | 5.60 | 1.31 | 3.37 | 26.29 |
| 7 | -09 | 3.42 | 2.54 | H. 44 | 5.60 | 1.78 | 6.31 | 26.11 |
| 8 | . 08 | 4.37 | 2.22 | 8.66 | 4.00 | 1.24 | 2.66 | 17.13 |
| 9 | . 00 | .27 | . 00 | . 09 | . 18 | . 05 | . 18 | . 80 |
| Total | .87 | 88.93 | 10.66 | 19.87 | 21.05 | 7.10 | 15.72 | 104.00 |

Table 12. Distributions of the Dollar Value of $100 \%$ Low Value Commodity by Country Series

Distribution of the doliar value of $100 \%$ lou value gertes for Maroh

|  | Country |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comodity | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 5 | 6 | 7 | $t$ | Total |
|  |  | 4841 | 6420 | 2367 | 2567 | 7753 | 1290 | - | 25440 |
| 1 | 1429 | 11012 | 11219 | 24200 | 13170 | 5154 | 13638 | 0 | 87538 |
| 2 |  | 1843 | 0 | 2938 | 7418 | - | 1032 | - | 20231 |
| 3 | 1463 | 4736 | 1160 | 3516 | 3731 |  | 1166 | - | 15792 |
| 4 | 0 | 58444 | 11737 | 4376 | 39181 | 13261 | 24338 | - |  |
| 5 | , | 127213 | 53669 | 99057 | 72106 | 19606 | $\begin{array}{r}45495 \\ \\ \hline 1954\end{array}$ | - | \$19146 |
| 6 | 0 | 102899 | 32358 | 82563 | 33927 | 48780 | 119546 | 0 | 490073 |
| 7 | 0 | 88584 | 31246 | 54741 | 60160 | 14337 | 43981 | 0 | 293069 |
| 9 | $9458{ }^{\circ}$ | 4764 11249 | $20438^{\circ}$ | $2444{ }^{\circ}$ | 4261 23066 | 15038 | 1134 | - | 11257 190321 |
| Total | 97472 | 429385 | 190247 | 342791 | 313007 | 187050 | 251660 | - | 1731812 |

Distribution of the dollar value of $100 \%$ low value sazies for duan

|  | Country |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commodity | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4 | Total |
| 0 | 0 | 8217 | 3469 | 1230 | 4945 | 0 | 2948 | 0 | 20809 |
| 1 | 1310 | 24795 | 12732 | 27156 | 17998 | 7402 | 9973 | 0 | 101366 |
| 2 | 0 | 3731 | 1059 | 1425 | 8180 | - | 0 | 0 | 16395 |
| 3 | - | 4880 | 2310 | 3574 | 1212 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11976 |
| 1 | 0 | 55956 | 20606 | 25705 | 37112 | 6985 | 34810 | - | 180975 |
| 5 | 2225 | 133196 | 63530 | 109896 | 103089 | 34503 | 61321 | - | 303760 |
| 6 | 0 | 101914 | 56230 | 64196 | 86701 | 24064 | 93470 | - | 426575 |
| 7 | 0 | 82772 | 40279 | 88705 | 56384 | 14678 | 41007 | 0 | 325825 |
| 8 | 0 | 1322 | 1050 | 2359 | 5164 | 1266 | 1470 | 0 | 19651 |
| 9 | 68610 | 13419 | 17951 | 21402 | 11584 | 10138 | - | - | 145104 |
| Total | 72145 | - 36202 | 219216 | 341648 | 332369 | 95057 | 246799 | $\bullet$ | 1747436 |

Diftcibution of the dellez value of $100 \%$ lof value saties for geptonber

| Comeodity | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 5 | 6 | 7 | $\cdots$ | Tetal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 4988 | 1200 | 5874 | 1127 | 2467 | - | - | 22456 |
| 1 | 0 | 26134 | 2383 | 14209 | 18134 | 8407 | 8634 | 0 | 77901 |
| 2 | 0 | 3766 | 1122 | 1442 | 3000 | 0 | 3944 | 0 | 13274 |
| 3 | 0 | 3654 | 2755 | - | 3319 | 0 | 1308 | 0 | 13028 |
| 4 | 0 | 38285 | 17473 | 29334 | -0058 | 1315 | 19328 | 0 | 172793 |
| 5 | 1060 | 142363 | 59706 | 99181 | 100712 | 23127 | 38170 | - | 465099 |
| 6 | 0 | 116200 | 47261 | 70003 | 79164 | 31517 | 78918 | - | 422663 |
| 7 | 0 | 84680 | 25792 | 45818 | 63717 | 12917 | 32667 | - | 271591 |
| B | 0 | 1176 | 1289 | 5918 | 1315 | 1140 | 7114 | - | 17952 |
| 9 | 124115 | 26769 | 31976 | 28855 | 24404 | 10890 | - | 0 | 247011 |
| Totel | 125175 | 448015 | 190939 | 304634 | 346020 | 98780 | 410375 | - | 1723958 |

Distribution of the dollar value of 1008 low value serios for Deceaber

|  | country |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comeodity | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 5 | 6 | 7 | - | Totel |
| - | , | 14377 | 0 | 0 | 3988 | 0 | 2328 | 0 | 20487 |
| 1 | 2.160 | 23955 | 18004 | 28845 | 22493 | 11590 | 1152 | 0 | 115186 |
| 2 | 0 | 2363 | 1331 | ${ }^{6}$ | 2731 | 1490 | 1038 | - | 8885 |
| 3 | 0 | 4693 | 2692 | 5469 | 0 | 1118 | 111 | - | 15153 |
| 4 | - | 35447 | 13473 | 43792 | 33040 | 460 | 27004 | 0 | 137416 |
| 5 | - | 107258 | 46891 | 97069 | 88443 | 21050 | 45573 | 0 | 406494 |
| 6 | - | 84973 | 38511 | 75604 | 1811 | 27210 | 96579 | 0 | 41168 |
| 7 | 1094 | 84011 | 36270 | 46494 | \$2337 | 22654 | 41293 | - | 894153 |
| 8 |  | 1606 | \% | 1030 | 2632 | 1400 | 8534 | - | 11222 |
| 9 | 62939 | 13754 | 28372 | 27874 | 17059 | 6217 | - | - | 156213 |
| Total | 66793 | 374447 | 183566 | 324201 | 321740 | 97299 | 229038 | $\bullet$ | 1897099 |

### 2.7. Schedule E Commodity by Mode of Transportation series

Low value percentages were calculated for each four digit Schedule $E$ commodity by mode of transportation series. A summary of the results are presented in Table 14.

The results for this class of export series are in sharp contrast to those of the previous section. The percentages of unaffected series (0\% low value) do not differ substantially by MOT and are slightly less than those for the country by vessel series. Approximately onefourth of the air series each month have more than $5 \%$ of their total composed of low value shipments; approximately one-tenth of the air series have low value percentages exceeding $10 \%$. In addition, although not large in number, air series accounted for at least two-thirds of the series composed entirely of low value shipments in each study month. Thus, the effect on the four digit commodity series is much more pronounced for air shipment series than for the remaining two MOT categories.

## -2.8 Schedule E Commodity by Country by Mode of Transportation Export Series

The most detailed level at which low value percentages were calculated in this study was the seven digit Schedule $E$ commodity by country by MOT level. There were approximately one hundred thousand such series in each study month. The distributions of these percentages are presented in Table 15 and some summary statistics are given in Table 16.

Although the distributions in Table 15 are still skewed to the right, the proportions of "large" low value percentages have increased compared to those for the less detailed classes of series considered in the previous subsections. Between $10.2 \%$ and $10.8 \%$ of these series have more than onefourth of their total values derived from low value shipments. This only drops to an average of 8. $2 \%$ for more than one-half of the total obtained from low value

## Table 13. Summary of the Monthly Distributions of Low Value Percentages for Country by MOT Series

March $\quad$| Study Month |
| :---: |
| June |

| Percent of series with $0 \%$ low value |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vessel | 21.5\% | 23.2\% | 21.7\% | 19.4\% |
| Other | 58.8\% | 36.0\% | 58.5\% | 59.3\% |
| Air | 5.7\% | 9.6\% | 8.1\% | 9.6\% |
| Percent of countries with less than $5 \%$ low value |  |  |  |  |
| Vessel | 98.7\% | 98.0\% | 96.7\% | 98.7\% |
| Other | 98.7\% | 87. $5 \%$ | 97.3\% | 95.3\% |
| Air | 98.6\% | 89.6\% | 86.3\% | 87.8\% |
| Number of series with $100 \%$ low value |  |  |  |  |
| - Vessel | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| - Other | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Air | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Combined value of $100 \%$ low value series | \$7869 | \$7697 | \$3549 | \$5898 |

Table 14. Summary of the Monthly Distributions of Low Value Percentages for Commodity by MOT Series
March June Study Month Sept. Dec.

Percent of series with 0\%
low value
Vessel $18.8 \% \quad 20.4 \% \quad 19.9 \% \quad 21.8 \%$
Other
11.9\%
13.5\% 11.3\%
12.1\%

Air
$14.6 \% \quad 14.8 \% \quad 13.4 \% \quad 16.1 \%$

Percent of series with less
than 5\% low value
Vessel
98.2\% 98.4\% 98.6\% 98.4\%

Other
89.4\%
90.3\% 88.8\%
90.4\%

Air
75.6\%
75.4\%
75.6\%
77.7\%

Number of series with $100 \%$
low value

| Vessel | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 0 ther | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 |
| Air | 4 | 9 | 11 | 8 |

Table 15. Distributions of the Percentage of Low Value Shipments for Commodity by Country by MOT Series

|  |  | March |  |  | June |  |  | September |  |  | December |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Interval |  | Count | Dist | CumDist | Count | Dist | CumDist | Count | Dist | CumDist | Count | Dist | Cumbist |
| 0 | 5 | 83933 | . 8182 | . 8182 | 82251 | . 8149 | . 8149 | 79080 | . 8195 | .8195 | 80081 | . 8242 | . 8242 |
| 5 | 10 | 3703 | . 0361 | . 8543 | 3718 | . 0368 | . 8517 | 3436 | . 0356 | . 8552 | 3375 | . 0347 | . 8590 |
| 10 | 15 | 1942 | . 0189 | . 8732 | 1932 | . 0191 | . 8709 | 1826 | . 0189 | . 8741 | 1770 | . 0182 | . 8772 |
| 15 | 20 | 1254 | . 0122 | . 8854 | 1233 | . 0122 | . 8831 | 1218 | . 0126 | . 8867 | 1211 | . 0125 | . 8897 |
| 20 | 25 | 929 | . 0091 | . 8945 | 919 | . 0091 | . 8922 | 863 | . 0089 | . 8956 | 834 | . 0086 | . 8982 |
| 25 | 30 | 713 | . 0070 | . 9014 | 729 | . 0072 | . 8994 | 651 | . 0067 | . 9024 | 647 | . 0067 | . 9049 |
| 30 | 35 | 610 | . 0059 | . 9074 | 581 | . 0058 | . 9051 | 572 | . 0059 | . 9083 | 534 | . 0055 | . 9104 |
| 35 | 40 | 562 | . 0055 | . 9129 | 565 | . 0056 | . 9107 | 544 | . 0056 | . 9140 | 511 | . 0053 | . 9157 |
| 40 | 43 | 417 | . 0041 | . 9169 | 487 | . 0048 | . 9156 | 416 | . 0043 | . 9183 | 378 | . 0039 | . 9195 |
| 45 | 50 | 211 | . 0021 | . 9190 | 210 | . 0021 | . 9177 | 220 | . 0023 | . 9206 | 223 | . 0023 | . 9218 |
| 50 | 55 | 121 | . 0012 | . 9202 | 108 | . 0011 | . 9187 | 93 | . 0010 | . 9215 | 102 | . 0010 | . 9222 |
| 55 | 60 | 101 | . 0010 | . 9211 | 105 | . 0010 | . 9198 | 102 | . 0011 | . 9226 | 92 | . 0009 | . 9238 |
| 60 | 65 | 50 | . 0005 | . 9216 | 63 | . 0006 | . 9204 | 62 | . 0006 | . 9232 | 51 | . 0005 | . 9244 |
| 65 | 70 | 29 | . 0003 | . 9219 | 28 | . 0003 | . 9207 | 33 | . 0003 | . 9236 | 26 | . 00003 | . 9246 |
| 70 | 75 | 20 | . 0002 | . 9221 | 17 | . 0002 | . 9208 | 16 | . 0002 | . 9237 | 9 | . 0001 | . 9247 |
| 75 | 80 | 6 | . 0001 | . 9222 | 9 | . 0001 | . 9209 | 13 | . 0001 | . 9239 | 7 | . 0001 | . 9248 |
| 80 | 85 | 2 | . 0000 | . 9222 | 4 | . 0000 | . 9210 | 5 | . 0001 | . 9239 | 4 | . 0000 | . 9248 |
| 85 | 9 | 0 | . 0000 | . 9222 | 1 | . 0000 | . 9210 | 3 | . 0000 | . 9239 | 1 | . 0000 | . 9248 |
| 90 | 95 | 0 | . 0000 | . 9222 | 1 | . 0000 | . 9210 | 0 | .0000 | . 9239 | 0 | . 0000 | . 9248 |
| 95 | 100 | 0 | . 0000 | . 9222 | 0 | . 0000 | . 9210 | 0 | . 0000 | . 9239 | 2 | . 0000 | . 9249 |
| 100 |  | 7982 | . 0778 | 1.0000 | 7976 | . 0790 | 1.0000 | 7339 | . 0761 | 1.0000 | 7300 | . 0751 | 1.0000 |

shipments. Depending on the study month, between $7.5 \%$ and $7.9 \%$ of these series consisted entirely of low value shipments. Hence, the published value of an average of 7944 series per month would have been at least cut in half and an average of 7650 series per month would not have appeared at all in the publications had the new exemption level been in effect. The series consisting entirely of low value shipments were valued at between $\$ 10.2$ million and $\$ 11.2$ million in the study months. This represents approximately $0.06 \%$ of the total value of exports.

Table 16. Summary Statistics for the Schedule $E$ Commodity by Country by MOT Export Series

| - | March | $\text { June }^{\text {Study }}$ | Month Sept. | Dec. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of series | 102,585 | 100,937 | 96,492 | 97,158 |
| Number with 0\% low value | 73,688 | 72,466 | 69,538 | 70,782 |
| Number with 100\% low value | 7,982 | 7,976 | 7,339 | 7,300 |
| Percent with 0\% low value | 71.8\% | 71.8\% | 72.1\% | 72.9\% |
| Percent with $100 \%$ low value | 7.8\% | 7.9\% | 7.6\% | 7.5\% |
| Value of 100\% low value series* | \$11.2 | \$10.9 | \$10.2 | \$10.2 |

* Entry is millions of dollars.

Table 17 contains the distributions of the $100 \%$ low value series over the one digit commodity by country by MOT categories. The corresponding distributions for the dollar values of these series are presented in Table 18. Overall, the month to month variation in these distributions is relatively small. From Table 17, over half of the series which would have been eliminated from the tabulations under the new exemption level are air shipment series. Relatively few are from modes of transportation other than vessel or air. Series involving destinations in Central America (200's), Europe (400's), and Asia (500's) each constitute approximately one-fourth of the $100 \%$ low value series. For the commodity groupings, Section 7 (Machinery and transport equipment) contains approximately one-third of these series while Sections 6 (Manufactured goods classified chiefly by material) and 8

Table 17. Distributions of the $100 \%$ Low Value Commodity by Country by MOT Series



| not = Vestal |  |  |  | Count |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sompetity | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 5 | 6 | 7 | Eetal |
| - | .19 | 1.60 | . 14 | .30 | . 88 | . 39 | . 13 | 8.34 |
| 1 | -10 | . 09 | . 6 | As | .11 | . 88 | . 81 | . 81 |
| 8 | . 06 | . 30 | . 13 | . 16 | , is | .08 | . 84 | . 81 |
| 3 | . 88 | . 81 | .85 | .89 | .13 | .18 | . 01 | .35 |
| 3 | . 13 | 8.31 | 1.18 | 1.10 | 1.76 | .4 | .31 | 7.17 |
| 6 | - 04 | 3.31 | . 78 | 1.40 | \$. 18 | - ${ }^{4}$ | -1 | 8. 36 |
| 7 | . 11 | 2.71 | 1.24 | 1.48 | 1.70 | - 18 | . 74 | 0.34 |
| ¢ | - 0 | 2.11 | .61 | 1.25 | 1.38 | . 18 | .31 | 6. 14 |
|  | . 18 | .11 | . 00 | . 03 | .11 | .18 | . 03 | .09 |
| Tetal | . 18 | 18.08 | - 1.86 | 1.91 | 7.76 | 2.16 | 8.17 | 38.66 |
| n02 - ethes |  |  |  | Cevet |  |  |  |  |
| Comedtef | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | $\delta$ | 6 | 7 | Tetel |
| - | . 14 | . 25 | .00 | . 86 | . 0 | . 0 | . 0 | . 45 |
| 1 | . 13 | .01 | .00 | .11 | -0 | 0 | .08 | .08 |
| 2 | - 10 | . 18 | -0 | .13 | .15 | . 0 | $: 1$ | 0.36 |
| 3 | .81 | .81 | .09 | .04 | -60 | .06 | .01 | . 09 |
| 8 | .11 | .81 | .00 | .81 | .68 | .89 | .81 | 9.17 |
| 5 | . 21 | .31 | .11 | . 35 | . 11 | 41 | .09 | 1.27 |
| 7 | . 18 | . 31 | .03 | 1.06 | .20 | .20 | -11 | 8.6 |
| $\theta$ | .23 | .81 | .83 | . 86 | .23 | .18 | . 06 | 1.81 |
| Tetal | .98 | 1.83 | . 09 | 3.82 | .54 | . 34 | . 33 | 7.43 |
| net Mt |  |  |  | cemat |  |  |  |  |
| Comeodity | 1 | 8 | 1 | - | 5 | 6 | 7 | Petal |
| - | .16 | . 33 | . 09 | .36 | . 30 | . 02 | .01 | 1.45 |
| 1 | . 6 | .83 | . 04 | .81 | . 05 | .08 | .8 | . 16 |
| 8 | .16 | - 01 | . 09 | . 11 | . 26 | -18 | .10 | 1.19 |
|  | .63 | .81 | .80 | .18 | .89 | .61 | .81 | . 34 |
| 8 | .11 | 1.06 | 1.00 | 2.31 | 1.80 | . 44 | .11 | 7.08 |
| 8 | - 88 | 2.17 | + 8 | 1.3 | 8.86 | . 87 | -3 | 19.29 |
| 7 | . 18 | 1.88 | \%.85 | 8.68 | 8.17 1.83 | 1.17 | 1.68 | 80.15 |
| 0 | .61 | . 10 | .04 | . 08 | 2.11 | .tb | . 11 | . 48 |
| Tetal | 1.18 | 11.65 | 6.85 | 16.11 | 18.98 | 3.88 | 8.60 | 86.92 |



| H07 5 Vessel |  |  |  | count |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comodity | 1 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Tetal |
| - | .10 | 1.83 | . 19 | . 26 | . 76 | . 35 | . 16 | 3.86 |
| 1 | . 08 | . 14 | . 04 | . 05 | .08 | .11 | . 04 | . 31 |
| 8 | .10 | .43 | . 18 | .21 | . 19 | .69 | .46 | 1.17 |
| 1 | . 0 | . 18 | . 01 | -09 | . 01 | -04 | - ${ }^{4}$ | . 51 |
| - | . 0 | . 06 | 0.1 | . 04 | .04 | . 08 | . 0 | - 16 |
| 5 | .0 | 2.60 | 1.17 | . 94 | 1.72 | .93 | .48 | 7.26 |
| 1 | .8 | 3.18 1.12 | . 64 | 1.18 | 1.57 | . 56 | . 71 | 0.38 |
| - | .10 | 8.97 | .79 | 1.67 | 1.13 | .10 | . 88 | 8.82 |
| $\bigcirc$ | . 00 | .61 | .61 | -64 | . 01 | .11 | .13 | . 11 |
| Setal | . 10 | 13.77 | -.28 | 5.14 | 7.36 | 2.42 | 2.53 | 36.00 |
| H02 6 Othes |  |  |  | Count |  |  |  |  |
| Comedity | 1 | 8 | 3 | - | 8 | 6 | 7 | Potas |
| * | . 10 | . 34 | . 8 | . 85 | . 04 | . 1 | . 1 | . 31 |
| 1 | .00 | .80 | . 0 | 00 | .00 | .00 | 0 | 06 |
| 4 | .06 | .05 | .11 | . 08 | .01 | .11 | .11 | .23 |
| 3 | .16 | .18 | . 01 | .06 | . 06 | .0 | - 0 | . 21 |
| 8 | -18 | 08 | . 8 | -61 | - 8 | . 06 | -1 | -1 |
| 8 | .16 | .16 | .81 | . 61 | .86 | .89 | .63 | 1.65 |
| 9 | .89 | .16 | .01 | 1.22 | .84 | .ty | .16 | 8.12 |
| 8 | .23 | .13 | .81 | 1.68 | -18 | .05 | -88 | 1.9 |
| Setas | . 98 | 1.40 | . 14 | 3.66 | . 85 | . 21 | .84 | 7.31 |
| H0f Mr |  |  |  | Coune |  |  |  |  |
| Comotity | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 5 | 6 | 2 | Totat |
| - |  |  | . 04 | . 24 |  |  | . 04 |  |
| 1 | .61 | .11 | . 0 | . 0 | .01 | .11 | .00 | . 18 |
| 8 | .06 | . 11 | .88 | . 39 | .16 | .01 | .06 | 1.01 |
| 3 | . 0 | 0.8 | . 8 | -is | . 16 | -6 | 08 | - 81 |
| 1 | -28 | 1.18 | 1.14 | 20.4\% | \$:74 | 13 | .20 | 2.81 |
| 6 | .68 | 8.84 | 1.19 | 3.39 | 3.11 | .71 | .30 | 12. 18 |
| 7 | - 81 | 9.34 | 8.21 | 5.42 | \%. 18 | .98 | 1.19 | 19.73 |
| 6 | .48 | 2.45 | 1.39 .81 | 4.23 | 3.32 .18 | . 80 | . 71 | 14.39 .65 |
| 8etal | 8.06 | 12. 11 | 6.11 | 16.41 | 13.53 | 8.07 | 1.01 | 86.78 |

Table 17. (Continued)

Distribution of the neat ien value coacolity by country by mot series at a

| 408 - Vassel |  |  |  | Cemate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ceneodlsy | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 7 | Tetal |
| - | .10 | 1.7) | . 85 | .27 | . 63 | . 55 | .10 | 3.43 |
| 1 | . 14 | .07 | .80 | .87 | . 16 | .84 | .06 | . 26 |
| 2 | .11 | . 48 | . 8 | . 18 | .25 | . 10 | .04 | 1.81 |
| 3 | . 80 | . 15 | . 8 | . 14 | . 81 | .01 | . 18 | . 3 |
| 5 | .80 | 1.85 | 1.08 | . 81 | 1.54 | :81 | - 21 | .18 |
| 6 | .43 | 3.61 | . .89 | 1.47 | 1.61 | .48 | .88 | 8.27 |
| 7 | . 10 | 2.85 | 1.23 | 1.19 | 2.04 | - 48 | . 1 | 8.16 |
| 8 | -18 | 1.92 | .31 | 1.21 | 1.06 | . 10 | .23 | 8.35 |
| $\bigcirc$ | . 6 | . 04 | . 00 | . 11 | .01 | .03 | - 01 | . 18 |
| Tetal | . 18 | 18.50 | 3.76 | 5.80 | 1.48 | 2.65 | 1.92 | 34.28 |
| Mot a Diluez |  |  |  | Cowner |  |  |  |  |
| Coasolitr | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 3 | 6 | 7 | Tetal |
| - | .07 | .18 | . $0 *$ | . 08 | .04 |  | .04 | .30 |
| 1 | .61 | 010 | .00 | .01 | .00 | .10 | .00 | . 34 |
| 2 | .13 | -08 | .80 | . 08 | .63 | .08 | . 18 | . 23 |
| 1 | .81 | 0.1 | .00 | . 13 | .08 | 0 | -00 | 48 |
| 1 | .80 | :11 | - 08 | . 48 | :017 | - 0 | - 09 | . 61 |
| 8 | . 27 | .18 | .81 | . 48 | .01 | .81 | . 18 | 8.81 |
| 7 | .10 | .17 | .63 | 1.16 | . 19 | .01 | . 11 | 1.98 |
| 8 | . 23 | .83 | .63 | . 80 | . 19 | .10 | . 10 | 1.95 |
| - | .13 | .60 | .00 | -6s | .00 | .63 | .11 | . 12 |
| total | . 18 | 8.45 | .18 | 3.17 | . 30 | . 87 | . 41 | 7.11 |
| M0\% - Ms |  |  |  | Cenet |  |  |  |  |
| Comodity | 1 | $t$ | 3 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 7 | . 3etel |
| - | . 10 | . 50 | . 12 | .41 | .41 | . 10 |  | 1.68 |
| 1 | .11 | .63 | .11 | - 4 | -04 |  | -6 | 0.18 |
| 2 | :11 | . 16 | . 18 | .13 | .87 | . 81 | -08 | 8.18 |
| 4 | .10 | .08 | .81 | .16 | .12 | .81 | .81 | . 14 |
| 5 | - 18 | 1. 19 | 1.04 | \%.21 | 8.02 | . 36 | .37 | 7.28 |
| 6 | -32 | 2.13 | 1.16 | 3.61 | 2.97 | . 59 | 8.41 | 11.38 |
| 8 | . 41 | 3.47 | 1.32 | 4.46 | 3.84 | 1.85 | 8.18 | 14.85 |
| - | .00 | .11 | . 03 | .11 | .10 | . 60 | . 18 | . 19 |
| Petal | 2.06 | 11.81 | 6.27 | 16.42 | 15.55 | 2.93 | 3.35 | 38.38 |

Blatribution of thi iegr lou value consodity by country by not serite as a perentase of all ioox tou value geries for decenter

| not - Yast |  |  |  | Count |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Semadity | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | 6 | 7 | Tetal |
| - | .10 | 1.73 | . 15 | . 83 | .81 | .42 | . 14 | 3.12 |
| 1 | . 09 | . 10 | . 06 | .83 | :10 | .08 | 01 | . 23 |
| 2 | . 00 | .11 | . 14 | . 18 | . 19 | .68 | .07 | 1.0 |
| 3 | .10 | . 21 | . 08 | . 10 | . 14 | . 88 | . 04 | . 60 |
| 1 | .06 | 8.47 | - 418 | 0.98 | 8.75 | -11 | .13 | .21 .82 |
| 6 | .19 | 2.62 | 1.83 | 1.17 | 1.71 | - 51 | . 13 | 7.32 |
| 7 | .03 | 2.8 | 1.34 | 1.60 | 1.84 | 63 | .1 | 9.21 |
| d | .00 | 1.81 | .86 | 1.01 | 1.01 | .10 | .27 | 4.67 |
| 5 | .00 | .00 | .00 | . 06 | . 06 | . 01 | . 06 | . 0 |
| Tetel | . 18 | 13.03 | 4. 33 | 3.78 | 7.71 | 2.75 | 8.25 | 38.78 |
| Hot a 0the |  |  |  | Conat |  |  |  |  |
| Cemeotity | 1 | 8 | 3 | - | 1 | 6 | 1 | tetal |
| - | . 18 | .87 | .40 | .07 | .04 | .10 | . 10 | -19 |
| 1 | . 85 | .81 | .00 | .11 | .010 | 0 | -8. | . 8 |
| 8 | . 11 | .85 | .09 | -14 | 01 | .06 | .11 | .13 |
| 3 | -18 | . 04 | .08 | 08 | . 04 |  | 01 | -14 |
| 1 | .12 | .11 | . 09 | : 81 | .06 | $0 \cdot 6$ | - 0 | . 04 |
| d | : 22 | .16 | :18 | .si | .81 | :18 | -18 | 1.21 |
| 7 | .11 | - 18 | .3 | 1.16 | .22 | . 21 | -12 | 8.89 |
| 9 | . 28 | . 13 | .81 | .77 | .83 | .87 | -85 | 1.70 |
| Petel | 1.01 | 1.85 | . 10 | 8.30 | . 38 | . 34 | .37 | 7.32 |
| H01 a Ms |  |  |  | Corat |  |  |  |  |
| Comolity | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 5 | 6 | 7 | Petal |
| - | .67 | .88 | .10 | .40 |  |  |  |  |
| $1$ | . 10 | -85 | .9\% | -13 | .18 | -0. | -10 | +18 |
| 3 | .18 | .01 | . 15 | . 15 | .10 | 01 | . 16 | 1.33 |
| 0 | .10 | . 03 | .00 | . 65 | - 10 | \%0 | . 06 | .8 |
| 5 | . 11 | . 98 | 1.81 | 2. 32 | 1.77 | -44 | . 30 | 6.91 |
| 9 | . 38 | 2.38 | 2.8t | 3. 88 | 8.11 | . 817 | . 89 | 11.61 |
| 8 | .83 | 8.3 | 2.18 1.38 | 3.88 2.84 | 2. 21 | 1.87 | 1.78 | 22.75 11.73 |
| 9 | .80 | . 01 | . 0 | . 01 | .81 | - 8 | . 6 | . 87 |
| Total | 1.94 | 11.35 | 6.34 | 18.98 | 17.08 | 3.29 | 3.80 | 36.73 |

Table 18. Distributions of the Dollar Value of the $100 \%$ Low Value Commodity by Country by MOT Series


DLstribution of the collat value of 1007 lou value fories tof sume

| MOT - Yesmel | Countey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cenmodtisy | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 3 | 6 | 7 | Total |
| - | 18993 | 179397 | 23503 | 27915 | 11691 | 43787 | 86482 | 390964 |
| 1 | 10.8 | 13037 | 3469 | 6294 | 114 | 1411 | 489 | 35453 |
| 8 | - | 42749 | 20427 | 81082 | 20959 | 8645 | ¢ 48 | 122273 |
| 3 | 0 | 22996 | 10023 | 10251 | 6027 | 3675 | 379 | 5786 |
| - | - | 7135 | 2310 | 3701 | 3162 | 5 | ¢ | 17108 |
| 5 | - | 270334 | 121858 | 112324 | 182082 | 44.54 | 44338 | 77619 |
| 6 | - | 363357 | 19131 | 152185 | 163973 | 63314 | 56327 | 890217 |
| 7 | 1 | $344+52$ | 101646 | 135741 | 209814 | 61692 | 74.71 | $92: 829$ |
| 8 | 6 | 216129 2260 | 1756 1693 | 114506 1439 | 120633 | 3299 1500 | 35779 2670 | 621402 1280 |
| Total | 18093 | 1461406 | 459218 | 587708 | 799473 | 263479 | 866299 | 3853678 |
| not = other |  |  |  | Count |  |  |  |  |
| censollty | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 3 | * | 7 | Tetal |
| - | 14788 | 1638: | - | 9231 | - | 1011 | 1476 | -2e18 |
| 1 | ) | $1{ }^{\circ}$ | 0 |  |  | 0 | \% |  |
| 8 | 9863 | 4922 | 1114 | 27796 | 2631 | 1118 | 1245 | - 0 ¢ 413 |
| 3 | \% | 2405 |  | 4189 |  |  | 1200 | 898 1200 |
| 5 | 2817 | 20943 | 1144 | 77602 | 3931 |  | 2067 | 130782 |
| 6 | 11482 | 47313 | 1155 | 67134 | 2270 | 7118 | 7617 | 171339 |
| 7 | 11717 | 39155 | 2968 | 127321 | 23166 | 11232 | 9939 | 227538 222770 |
| , | cises | $3 / 42$ | 1030 | 18585 | 23873 | 6 | 588 | 2211836 |
| Petal | 123804 | 161310 | 13031 | 439937 | 61314 | 23553 | 34774 | 664723 |
| not e Alt |  |  |  | Count |  |  |  |  |
| Comadity | 1 | 2 | 3 | - | 5 | 6 | 9 | Tetal |
| $\bigcirc$ | 14511 | 12368 | 3768 | 23123 | 35128 | 11303 | - | 432488 |
| 1 | 1178 | 1100 |  | 1313 | 2192 | 1344 | $\theta$ | 1764 |
| 8 | 5935 | 10457 | 576 | -0331 | 2948 | 8693 | 6818 | 404691 |
| 8 |  | 2504 | 6101 | 5044 | 1802\% | - | - | 18678 |
| \% |  |  |  | 269548 | 1878 |  | 29302 | -8429 |
| 3 | 81116 | 119852 | 119176 | 266722 | 195846 | 18s12 | 29308 | 131376 |
| 6 | 64138 | 284705 | 131127 247259 | 370464 | 330509 52551 | g8\%13 | 151216 | 1313763 |
| 6 | 90479 | 316717 | 160190 | 46464 | 31634 | 12107 | 7354 | ¢Stys3 |
| $\bigcirc$ | 1160 | 9385 | 1200 | 19098 | 15038 | 3897 | 4Sts | 54887 |
| Tetal | 248809 | 1313983 | 677389 | 1819338 | 131402.5 | 139059 | 317456 | 6229835 |

Table 18. (Continued)



(Miscellaneous manufactured articles) each averaged siightly more than one-fifth of these series. For several commodity sections the loss of series would have been minimal. The conclusion to be drawn from Tables 17 and 18 is that the effect of the increase in the exemption level is not uniform across the commodity by country by MOT classification structure and, in fact, varies from essentially no effect to very noticeable effects.

## 3. Conclusion

The effect of the increase in the exemption level on a - sequence of increasingly more detailed classes of export series has been described in the previous section. The primary conclusion to be drawn from these results is not unexpected; at the aggregrate level the effect is negligible, but as the level of detail increases the effect becomes more pronounced.

Our principal measure of influence was the percentage of the value of each series which is composed of low value shipments. The distributions of these low value percentages were highly skewed to the right with spikes at $0 \%$ and $100 \%$. That is, in each class of series a very large proportion of the series would not have been seriously affected by the increase in the exemption level. However, an increasing proportion of the series were composed entirely of low value shipments as the level of detail increased. Such series would have been eliminated from the publication in the particular month.

The proportion of $100 \%$ low value series ranged from an average of less than $0.3 \%$ of the country and four digit commodity level series to an average of $4.6 \%$ for four digit commodity by country series and $7.7 \%$ of seven digit commodity by country by mode of transportation series. The magnitude of the losses in these latter classes is troublesome, but not surprising. Since the overall number of shipments is the same regardless of the level of detail, the number of shipments per series must necessarily decrease as the level of detail increases. At the most detailed level the data has been spread very thinly over the series in the class and a typical
series may contain only one or two shipments in a given month. These small sample sizes make it relatively easy to lose large numbers of series.

The second major conclusion is that there is interaction among the three factors (commodity, country, and MOT) which define the classes of export series. That is, differences among the levels of one factor depend upon the level of one or both of the remaining factors. Probably the most important instance is the differential effect on the three basic MOT categories. The interaction between the commodity and country factors at the one digit level (cf. Section 2.5) is another important example.

The differential effect in terms of the distribution of the value of low value shipments over MOT categories is summarized in Table 19. Air shipments series account for nearly half of the dollar value of low value shipments while they make up only slightly more than one-fourth of the total value of exports. The difference is reversed and greater for vessel series. A similar conclusion holds for the distribution of series which would have been eliminated from the tabulations. Additional evidence of the difference in the effect by MOT category can be found in Section 2. Hence, regardless of the measure used to quantify the effect, air series are the most severely affected and vessel series are the least affected.

Table 19. Distribution of the Value and Number of Low Value and Total Export Series by MOT*

|  | Vessel | Categ Other | Air |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Value of low value shipments | 11.8\% | 38.9\% | 49.4\% |
| Total value | 42.5\% | 29.8\% | 27.7\% |
| Percent of all $100 \%$ low value series** | 35.4\% | 7.4\% | 57. $2 \%$ |
| Percent of all series for given MOT** | 46.6\% | 11.8\% | 41.7\% |
| * Entries are averaged over the four ** Series at the commodity by country | study months. <br> by MOT level of detail. |  |  |

This study was based on four months of 1986 data. Somewhat unexpectedly, there was relatively little month to month variation in the various distributions and statistics which were computed. Since the conclusions from our study are being used, at least indirectly, to forecast the effect of the change in the exemption level for future months, their accuracy, and hence, usefulness as such, depends heavily on the absence of drastic changes in the export shipments populations which are to be tabulated in the future. Unfortunately, the only way to legitimately test this assumption of similarity would be to collect information on shipments below the exemption level (most likely on a sample basis) at some future date. The warning here should be clear; the results are historical in nature and any projection of them or their consequences into the future is extrapolation.

Finally, although our analysis deals only with the effect of removing shipments in the $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ range from the tabulations rather than all shipments under $\$ 1500$, it may provide some indication of the differences between the published statistics and the "true" values based on all exports if there were no exemption level. The accuracy of extending our conclusions to all shipments under $\$ 1500$ depends on one of two assumptions being valid; either the behavior of the under $\$ 1000$ data is essentially the same as that presented here for shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ or the effects of the under $\$ 1000$ data, regardless of how different they are, are negligible compared to those of the $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ data. As in the forecasting case, the assumptions can only be tested by collecting information on the unrecorded segment of future export shipments populations.
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UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

APPENDIX 1

February 19, 1987


Attached is the latest copy of the summary of the effect of the increase in the export reporting exemption level on various classes of export series. I've added a paragraph on the commodity by country series since the last draft that $I$ sent you. I agree that the entire summary is too long for the text of FT900 and FT990. Probably the paragraphs on total, country, commodity, and commodity by country would suffice. I would suggest tailoring the discussion to each publication as much as possible by selecting paragraphs from the summary which correspond to the major class(es) of series in that publication. I also think that the entire summary should be available somewhere, perhaps in the documentation which is sent out with EM522. Other publications should reference it as a source of further information. In my view this information on the effect of the increase is a temporary part of the text which would be deleted at some future date, say at the end of 1987.

With regard to the section of text on estimating low value exports, I agree that it needs to be updated to reflect the new exemption level. In addition, the last sentence of the section which mentions its effect on total exports should be expanded to several sentences describing the effect of the estimation more fully.

Finally, $I$ should have a complete report on my study of the effect of the new exemption level sometime in March.

## Effect of Increasing the Reporting Exemption Level for Exports

A study was conducted to evaluate the effect of the increase in the reporting exemption level for exports from $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ on the published export statistics. Four months of 1986 data were used in the evaluation; March, June, September, and December.

Shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ which will no longer be reported under the new exemption 1 imit constituted between $0.5 \%$ and $0.7 \%$ of the total dollar value of exports in the study months. The total value of such shipments in a study month ranged from $\$ 100.5$ million to $\$ 122.5 \mathrm{million}$. For vessel shipments, they accounted for approximately $0.2 \%$ of the total value of vessel shipments, for air shipments between $1.1 \%$ and $1.2 \%$ and for modes of transportation other than vessel or air between $0.7 \%$ and $1.2 \%$. The major portion of the total value of shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ were non-vessel shipments. Air shipments accounted for $46.6 \%$ to $52.5 \%$ of these shipments total value during the study months while other modes of transportation accounted for $34.2 \%$ to $42.8 \%$. Vessel shipments' share ranged from $10.6 \%$ to $13.3 \%$.

Export shipments were reported for 161 to 164 countries, depending on the study month. Approximately $97 \%$ of the countries each month had less than $5 \%$ of their total value of exports consisting of shipments in the $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ range. The median percentage varied from $0.5 \%$ to $0.6 \%$. (Half of the low value percentages are greater than the median and half are less than it.) From 13 to 17 countries had no shipments between $\$ 1000$ and \$1500. At the opposite extreme, there were two cases in which all shipments were valued below \$1500. This occurred in March for Mongolia (one shipment valued at \$1154) and in June for Albania (one shipment valued at \$1412). Thus, countries which would have been included in the tabulations based on the $\$ 1000$ exemption level may not appear in those based on the new exemption level. Although this can occur for the country level
series, it appears to be rare.
As in the past, estimates of the value of shipments under the exemption level are included in the total exports and the country level statistics under the heading "low-value shipments". See the section entitled "Estimated Data for LowValue Exports" for further details. These low value shipment estimates will offset the value of shipments lost because of the increase in the reporting exemption level. The ability of these estimates to accurately account for the losses described above was not investigated in this study.

During the four study months export shipments were reported for 647 four digit Schedule $E$ commodity codes. The percentage of these commodity series having less than $5 \%$ of their total value of exports consisting of shipments in the $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ range varied from $96.4 \%$ to $97.1 \%$. The median percentage of the commodity total between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ was approximately $0.75 \%$ in each study month. Between $7.3 \%$ and $8.5 \%$ of these commodity series had no shipments in the $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ range. In contrast, only one commodity series in March and two in September consisted entirely of shipments in this range and would have been included under the $\$ 1000$ exemption level but not under the new level.

The number of four digit Schedule $E$ commodity by country series reported in a study month ranged from 25657 to 26709. From $82.9 \%$ to $84.4 \%$ of these series had less than $5 \%$ of their total value of exports consisting of shipments valued in the $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ range. From $56.9 \%$ to $58.4 \%$ of these commodity by country series had no shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$, while only $4.3 \%$ to $4.8 \%$ of the series consisted entirely of shipments in this range. This latter group was composed of between 1126 and 1254 series, depending on the study month.

For country level tabulations by mode of transportation, the percentage of these series having less than $5 \%$ of their total value consisting of shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ ranged from $96.7 \%$ to $98.7 \%$ for vessel series, depending on the study month,
from $86.3 \%$ to $97.6 \%$ for air series, and from $87.5 \%$ to $98.7 \%$ for modes of transportation other than vessel or air. There were never more than five country by mode of transportation series in any study month which consisted entirely of shipments in the $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ range.

The number of four digit Schedule E commodity series reported in a study month ranged from 626 to 629 for vessel shipments, from 561 to 566 for air shipments, and from 630 to 638 for modes of transportation other than vessel or air. The percentage of these series having less than $5 \%$ of their total value consisting of shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ ranged from $98.2 \%$ to $98.6 \%$ for vessel series, from $75.4 \%$ to $77.7 \%$ for air series, and from $88.8 \%$ to $90.4 \%$ for modes of transportation other than vessel or air. The percentages for air shipments series increased to between $89.2 \%$ and $90.4 \%$ when examined for less than $10 \%$ of their total value consisting of shipments in the $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ range. Of the approximately 1825 commodity by mode of transportation series in each study month, the number consisting entirely of shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ ranged from 6 to 15, of which at least two-thirds in each month were air shipments series.

For the approximately one hundred thousand seven digit Schedule $E$ commodity code by country by mode of transportation series, $7.5 \%$ to $7.9 \%$ were composed entirely of shipments between $\$ 1000$ and $\$ 1500$ in the study months and would not have appeared in the publication under the new exemption level. This represents between 7300 and 8000 series, a majority of which are air shipments series. The lost air shipments series constituted between $10.4 \%$ and $10.8 \%$ of all air shipments series at this level of detail.

The Effect of Raising the Export Exemption Level to $\$ 1500$ Effective with January 1987 Statistics

The results of an evaluation of low-value export shipments and the effects of raising the exemption level from $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ on various levels of statistical detail are presented below. The percentages shown may vary from month-to-month, however the "worst case" situations are always cited.

Estimates of low-valued shipments are by country only; no estimates are made on a commodity or method of transportation basis. Categories largely comprised of low value shipments are subject to the greatest effects from the increase in the exemption level. In a limited number of instances commodity, country, or method of transportation totals may disappear entirely if all shipments in those periods are below the exemption level. The following information is intended to give data users a general understanding of how the new exemption may affect the data.

1. Overall export total

- Shipments valued from $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ represent less than 0.7 percent of overall export value.
- Estimates at the previous $\$ 1000$ exemption level amounted to approximately 1.6 percent of overall export value; therefore, the estimate at the $\$ 1500$ level should not exceed 2.5 percent.

2. Country Totals

- The median percentage of country totals accounted for by shipments $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ is 0.6 percent.
- Of, the 160-165 countries represented in any month, only one or two will entirely consist of shipments $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$.

3. Four-digit commodity totals

- Shipments valued $\$ 1000$ to $\$ 1500$ represent on average about 0.75 percent of the value of each commodity.
- Of the 650 four-digit commodities about 8.5 percent have no shipments valued under $\$ 1500$.

4. Four-digit commodity by country totals

- Of approximately 26,000 four-digit commodity by country totals per month, less than 5 percent consist entirely of shipments under $\$ 1500$; however, almost 60 percent of these commodity by country cells have no shipments below $\$ 1500$.

5. Seven digit commodity by country by method of transportation totals

- There are approximately 100,000 of these totals per
- month.
- Less than 8 percent consist entirely of shipments under $\$ 1500$, but most of these are air shipments.
- Almost 11 percent of the air data cells at this level of detail were dropped as a result of raising the exemption level to $\$ 1500$. This is in addition to about 15 percent of air data cells lost at the previous $\$ 1000$ exemption level.


[^0]:    *Entries are in millions of dollars.
    $m=\$ 1154 ; \mathrm{j} 1=\$ 1412 ; \mathrm{j} 2=\$ 7725$.

