**Cross-Hauling and Regional** **Input−Output Tables: Can CHARM Make Adequate Adjustments for Cross-Hauling?**

**Anthony T. Flegg**

*Department of Accounting, Economics and Finance, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK*

E-mail: [tony.flegg@uwe.ac.uk](mailto:tony.flegg@uwe.ac.uk)

**Yongming Huang**

*Center forIndustry-University-Research Collaboration, Institute for Development of Central China, Wuhan University, Wuhan, People’s Republic of China*

E-mail: [hym@whu.edu.cn](mailto:hym@whu.edu.cn)

**Timo Tohmo**

*School of Business and Economics, University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland*

Email: [timo.tohmo@jyu.fi](mailto:timo.tohmo@jyu.fi)

**Abstract**

This paper reviews the available empirical evidence on the performance of Kronenberg’s CHARM (Cross-Hauling Adjusted Regionalization Method), a relatively new non-survey technique that accounts explicitly for cross-hauling when constructing regional input−output tables. Our focus is on the evidence presented in Flegg and Tohmo (2013a) and in Flegg *et al.* (2015). These papers employ survey-based data for two contrasting regions: Uusimaa, the largest Finnish province, and the central Chinese province of Hubei. In the case of Uusimaa, detailed data for 26 regional sectors in 2002 are examined. CHARM is found to perform relatively well in terms of its ability to generate adequate estimates of exports, imports, the volume and balance of trade, and supply multipliers. The results are particularly encouraging for manufacturing sectors, which typically produce heterogeneous commodities and where cross-hauling is rife. As regards Hubei, CHARM is used to construct a detailed regional input−output table with 42 sectors, including 17 different types of manufacturing. The analysis makes use of official published national and regional data for 2007. However, in this instance, CHARM does not generate realistic estimates of Hubei’s sectoral exports, imports, volume of trade, and supply multipliers. This outcome is attributed to the difficulty of getting satisfactory estimates of regional technology, heterogeneity and final demand for this data set. This problem is, in turn, linked to the relatively small size of Hubei, which generates around 4% of China’s GDP. By contrast, Uusimaa produced 34.6% of Finland’s national output in 2002. These findings highlight the crucial importance, especially in relatively small regions, of adjusting for any known divergence between regional and national technology, heterogeneity and final demand. Various strategies are explored for implementing such adjustments.

**1. INTRODUCTION**

Regional input−output tables are a very useful tool for regional planning, yet constructing a survey-based regional table can be complex, expensive and time consuming. Analysts usually endeavour to ‘regionalize’ the national table, so that it mirrors a region’s economic structure as far as possible (Jackson, 1998). However, standard methods of regionalization − especially those based on the commodity balance (CB) method or on simple location quotients (SLQs) − are prone to understate interregional trade. This problem occurs because these methods disregard *cross-hauling* (the simultaneous exporting and importing of a given commodity) and do not consider a region’s relative size.

In an effort to tackle the problem of cross-hauling, Kronenberg (2009) proposed an innovative new non-survey routine for constructing regional tables, the Cross-Hauling Adjusted Regionalization Method (CHARM). CHARM incorporates a systematic procedure for adjusting the volume of imports and exports to allow for cross-hauling, which is held to vary directly with the heterogeneity of products, along with regional output and demand.

Whereas abundant empirical evidence exists on the relative performance of the SLQ and related techniques, little is known about the likely effectiveness of CHARM as a way of regionalizing national input−output tables. To the present authors’ knowledge, the only empirical studies currently available are those by Flegg and Tohmo (2013a), who examined data for Finland and its largest province, Uusimaa, and Kronenberg and Többen (2015), who studied data for the German federal state of Baden−Württemberg. More tests are clearly needed, especially for countries less economically advanced than Finland and Germany.

Two notable exceptions to the paucity of survey-based regional tables are Finland and China. Official regional tables for all Finnish regions are available for 1995 and 2002. In this case, we discuss data for 2002 pertaining to Uusimaa, Finland’s largest province. The discussion is based on the study by Flegg and Tohmo (2013a). As regards China, regional tables for most provinces and municipalities are constructed quinquennially. Here we focus on the province of Hubei, which has a diversified regional economy and occupies a key position in central China. Our discussion is based on the study by Flegg *et al.* (2015), who used the published tables for Hubei and China to carry out a detailed empirical test of CHARM’s performance. As far as the present authors are aware, this is the first study to have used Chinese data in this way.

The two case studies examined here are especially suitable in two key respects. The first is that Finland and China differ greatly in terms of variables such as income per head, the size and composition of GDP, population and surface area. It is of interest, therefore, to see whether such disparities affect CHARM’s performance. Secondly, the input−output table for Hubei is more detailed than that for Uusimaa, with forty-two rather than twenty-four sectors, including seventeen separate types of manufacturing. This finer detail makes it possible to perform a more searching analysis.

This paper is structured as follows. The theoretical foundations of CHARM are examined in the next section. This is followed by case studies of Uusimaa and Hubei. In each case, we explain how CHARM was used to estimate regional exports, imports and the volume of trade. We also assess how well CHARM is able to simulate interregional trade and sectoral supply multipliers. The penultimate section considers possible ways of enhancing CHARM’s performance, while the final section concludes.

**2. CROSS-HAULING AND CHARM**

CHARM is an example of a pure non-survey method, whereby a very limited amount of regional data (such as sectoral employment) is used to regionalize the national input−output table in the initial stages. Although these first steps are entirely mechanical, analysts can subsequently incorporate superior data in an effort to improve their models. Regionalization via the use of location quotients (LQs) is another example of a pure non-survey approach.

Since CHARM is a refinement of the classical CB approach to constructing a regional input−output table (Isard, 1953), it is appropriate to begin by considering the key concepts underlying the CB method. At the outset, the analyst would need to use the following formula to estimate the demand for each regional sector:

, (1)

where  is total regional demand for commodity *i* in region *r*,  is the national technical coefficient (the number of units of commodity *i*, irrespective of source, needed to produce one unit of gross output of national industry *j*),  is output of regional industry *j*,  is intermediate demand, and  is final demand. A key assumption here is that the region and the nation share the same technology. This assumption reflects the fact that data on regional technology are rarely available. Where regional sectoral output is unknown, as is often the case, employment can be used as a proxy.

If  the entire surplus is assumed to be exported; conversely, if  it is presumed that sufficient imports will be available to make up for the shortfall in regional output. Cross-hauling is ruled out. The CB method operates on the principle of maximum local trade, i.e. ‘if commodity *i* is available from a local source, it will be purchased from that source’ (Harrigan et al*.*, 1981, p. 71). One problem with this principle is that it ‘ignores the fact that any industry commodity in practice will be an aggregation of a number of quite distinct commodities’ (*ibid.*), so that cross-hauling is almost bound to occur. Moreover, Richardson (1985, p. 613) remarks that ‘[a]lthough industrial disaggregation helps to relieve the cross[-]hauling problem, it does not solve it.’ Consequently, other explanations of cross-hauling need to be explored.

Cross-hauling is ubiquitous in small regions that do not represent a functional economic area (Robison and Miller, 1988) but it is also a serious concern in larger regions (Kronenberg, 2009). It is apt to be encountered in densely populated and highly urbanized countries, especially those where commuting across regional boundaries is important (Boomsma and Oosterhaven, 1992). Kronenberg identifies the *heterogeneity* of commodities as the main cause of cross-hauling and CHARM represents a novel way of dealing with this problem.

The interregional trade in automobiles between Hubei and other Chinese provinces is a good example of cross-hauling due to product differentiation. For instance, Dongfeng-Citroën cars are shipped from Wuhan, where this company’s headquarters is situated, to Shanghai and Beijing, where Shanghai-Volkswagen and Beijing-Hyundai have their headquarters, while Shanghai-Volkswagen and Beijing-Hyundai cars are shipped to Wuhan.

Although product differentiation may well be the primary cause of cross-hauling, we should also recognize that, in reality, many input−output sectors represent an aggregation of several distinct commodities, so that cross-hauling is very likely to occur. The sector entitled ‘Paper, printing, stationery and sporting goods’ in Hubei exemplifies this point. Suppose that Hubei is an importer of sporting goods but an exporter of paper, printing and stationery; this would create an illusion of cross-hauling, which would vanish if sporting goods were reallocated into a separate sector. Even so, as identical sectoral classifications are used in the tables for China and Hubei, there is no extra heterogeneity from this source.

Let us now compare and contrast CHARM with the CB method. A key similarity is that both methods employ national transaction tables that incorporate imports; this is because they aim to capture the underlying technology of production (Kronenberg, 2012). Also, both employ the concept of a *commodity balance*; for commodity *i*, this balance, *bi*, is defined as:

*bi ≡ ei – mi*, (2)

where *ei* and *mi*denote exports and imports, respectively, and *bi* represents net exports. The value of *bi* is computed as the estimated output of commodity *i* minus the estimated sum of intermediate and domestic final use (Kronenberg, 2009, p. 46). In the case of Uusimaa and Hubei, the output of each sector is given in the official tables and thus does not need to be estimated.

However, while CHARM and the CB method yield identical values for *bi*, they give different values, in general, for the volume of trade, *ei + mi.* This is because CHARM takes cross-hauling, *qi*, explicitly into account via the following equation (*ibid.*, p. 47):

*qi =* (*ei + mi*) *–* |(*ei – mi*)|. (3)

Thus *qi* will be greater, the larger the volume of trade and the smaller the absolute trade balance. In the CB method, *qi* *=* 0 as *ei* > 0 and *mi* > 0 cannot, by assumption, occur together. By contrast, with CHARM, *qi* >0 is possible and, indeed, probable in most cases.

For purposes of estimation, Kronenberg posits that *qi* is proportional to the sum of domestic production, *xi*, intermediate use, z*i*, and domestic final use, *fi*. The factor of proportionality, *hi*, captures the heterogeneity of commodities, as shown in the equation:

*qi = hi(xi* + z*i* + *fi*), (4)

where 0 ≤ *hi* < ∞ (*ibid.*, p. 51). Consequently, *hi = qi* /*(xi* + z*i* + *fi*), where *qi* is givenby equation (4). Kronenberg assumes that *hi* is invariant across regions and depends solely on the characteristics of products; it can, therefore, be estimated using national data. (This key assumption is reviewed later in this paper.) We would get *hi =* 0 if *qi* = 0, which would occur if *ei =* 0 with *mi* > 0 or *mi =* 0 with *ei* > 0 or *ei =* *mi =* 0.

**3. COMMODITY BALANCES, EXPORTS AND IMPORTS**

At the outset, the following formula was employed to estimate the commodity balance (net exports) for each commodity in each region:

, (5)

where  is estimated net exports of commodity *i*,  is regional output of this commodity, as shown in the official statistics, is the estimated sum of regional intermediate use, is estimated regional final use and  is the estimated residual error.

was calculated using the formula:

, (6)

where  is the estimated value of intermediate inputs of commodity *i* needed by regional industry *j*,  is the national technical coefficient and  is the output of regional industry *j*. It was assumed that regions and the nation shared the same technology. The values of and  were calculated by scaling down the respective national values using the formulae:

, (7)

, (8)

where  is the ratio of total regional to total national output. This proportional scaling is a very common approach, which is dictated by the lack of more refined data in most cases. Its appropriateness is explored later in this paper.

Equation (5) is all that is needed for the CB method, which does not give separate estimates of exports and imports, and presumes that the volume of trade is equal to the absolute trade balance. However, with CHARM, some further manipulations are required in order to take cross-hauling into account (cf. Kronenberg, 2009, p. 50). The first step is to rearrange equation (3) to solve for the volume of trade, *vi*:

*vi ≡ ei + mi* =|*bi*| + *qi*, (9)

where *bi* (net exports) can be estimated via equation (5). For *qi* (cross-hauling), we use:

, (10)

where  is the measure of heterogeneity of commodities (based on national data). Finally, we need to rearrange equation (9) to get expressions for regional exports and imports:

*ei* = ½(*vi* + *bi*), (11)

*mi* = ½(*vi* *–* *bi*). (12)

Via these expressions, we can estimate each region’s sectoral exports and imports separately, along with its volume of trade.

**4. CASE STUDY OF UUSIMAA**

In order to assess CHARM’s performance, benchmark regional data for imports, exports and multipliers are required. Fortunately, in the case of Finland, the necessary figures can be derived for all regions in 2002. Here we examine data for Uusimaa, the largest region, which produced 34.6% of national output in 2002 and accounted for 31.4% of aggregate employment. Uusimaa’s diversified industrial structure is illustrated in Table 1.

**Table 1**

A lack of regional data meant that the 59 national sectors had to be reduced to the 26 sectors displayed in Table 1, so there is some unavoidable loss of information and consequential aggregation bias. In evaluating the relative performance of CHARM and the CB method, we use the regional data generated by Statistics Finland as a benchmark.

**Table 2**

As expected, Table 2 shows that the CB method substantially underestimates Uusimaa’s total exports and imports and, consequently, its volume of trade. CHARM performs markedly better, although it too understates the overall amount of trade. This superior relative performance is primarily due to the fact that CHARM takes cross-hauling into account, whereas the CB method rules out the possibility of a sector’s being both an exporter and an importer of a given commodity.

**Table 3**

From Table 3, we can see that CHARM almost invariably produces the best estimates of the volume of trade in individual sectors. This pattern is especially noticeable as regards manufacturing (sectors 5 to 15), where it can be explained by the heterogeneity of many manufactured products and the concomitant cross-hauling. Sector 13 is a good example: whereas CHARM captures 83.2% of the volume of trade, the CB method accounts for only 30.2%. Furthermore, the more detailed results in Table 2 reveal that CHARM captures almost all of the exports in sector 13 and two-thirds of the imports; by contrast, the CB method accounts for half of the exports but none of the imports.

The disparities between CHARM and the CB method are generally less striking for non-manufacturing sectors. We should not expect cross-hauling to be an issue for many service industries, so CHARM is unlikely to outperform the CB method. Indeed, both methods perform very poorly indeed in the sectors Hotels and Restaurants (19) and Education (24), although the amount of trade involved is modest. Moreover, there are three sectors (2, 17 and 25) where both methods dramatically overstate the volume of trade and by comparable amounts. This problem can, in turn, be attributed to errors in estimating the *balance* of trade, *bi*, which equals net exports. Table 2 records estimates for *bi* of –353.4, –1,175.5 and –538.3 (× €1 million) for sectors 2, 17 and 25, respectively, which are not at all like the corresponding target figures of –122, 163 and 63. In the case of Construction (sector 17), the error is due to the fact that the intermediate and final demands for construction were overestimated by 6.5% and 7.8%, respectively, while output was underestimated by 14.0%. For Health and Social Work (sector 25), the error can be attributed a 10.4% overstatement of final demand and a 4.9% understatement of output. Finally, for Forestry and Logging (sector 2), output was overstated by 24.8%, yet this error was dwarfed by the fact that the intermediate and final demands for this sector’s output were overestimated by 97.9% and 120.6%, respectively.

It should be noted that we followed Kronenberg (2009) in making certain assumptions in our calculations of sectoral output and demand. In particular, we used employment data as a proxy for output. This is likely to be problematic in cases where there is a significant divergence between regional and national labour productivity. We also assumed identical national and regional technology. Finally, in calculating the regional final use of each commodity, we simply used the ratio of total regional to total national employment to scale down the national figures (cf. Kronenberg, 2009, p. 46).

**Figure 1**

Figure 1 highlights the fact that, almost invariably, the CB method substantially underestimates the volume of Uusimaa’s imports. CHARM generally performs much better, although it does still often understate the volume of imports. This understatement is especially noticeable for sectors 5, 8, 13, 20 and 22. On the other hand, both methods substantially overstate imports for sectors 17 and 25.

Turning now to the estimates of supply multipliers in Table 3, we can see that both methods typically overstate the size of these multipliers, although CHARM comes much closer to the target on average. CHARM is invariably the better method for manufacturing (sectors 5 to 15) but the pattern is less clear-cut for the non-manufacturing sectors. For instance, the CB method generates the closest estimates for Construction (17) and Health and Social Work (25). Nevertheless, in terms of the mean proportional error (MPE), it is clear that CHARM is by far the more accurate of the two methods: it yields an average error of 4.0% versus 12.4% for the CB method.

To shed some light on the possible causes of these errors, we reworked our results using output rather than employment data. As expected, accuracy improved, yet most of the error remained. In particular, the MPE fell to 3.0% for CHARM and to 10.4% for the CB method. The limited extent of this improvement is due to the fact that labour productivity in Uusimaa is typically not very different from that in Finland. This outcome can, in turn, be attributed to Uusimaa’s predominance in the Finnish economy. In other regions, especially those that are relatively small and located far from Helsinki, the divergence between national and regional labour productivity is apt to be more pronounced and the consequences more substantial.

The results obtained here for Uusimaa are certainly encouraging in terms of the effectiveness of CHARM as a regionalization method in situations where type A regional tables are most appropriate. Type A tables are those where imports are included in the regional and national transactions. However, one should always be cautious in generalizing from the findings of a case study of a single region. For this reason, we repeated our analysis for a further eleven Finnish regions, which varied in terms of their characteristics. We found that CHARM invariably outperformed the CB method in these regions as well, and by a wide margin. Even so, the estimates generated by CHARM for these other regions were substantially less accurate than those obtained for Uusimaa. A possible explanation of this finding is that it is due to a greater divergence between regional and national labour productivity in these other regions. This hypothesis suggests that it might be fruitful to attempt to make some adjustment for differences in productivity when using CHARM to construct regional input–output tables. It is also worth pursuing the reasons why CHARM consistently overstated the size of the supply multipliers, both in Uusimaa and in the other regions we examined.

**5. CASE STUDY OF HUBEI**

The province of Hubei is located in central China. It produced around 4.0% of China’s GDP in 2010 and employed about 2.8% of its urban labour force.**1** 44.3% of Hubei’s population resided in urban areas in 2007, a figure that is almost identical to that for China (44.9%).**2** Hubei has a diversified economy. The main agricultural products include cotton, rice, wheat and tea, while important industries include automobiles, iron and steel, chemicals, food and beverages, textiles, machinery and equipment, power generation, shipbuilding and construction, along with high-technology products such as optical electronics and telecommunications. Hubei also has significant mineral and forestry resources.**3**

Hubei is traversed by two great rivers, the Yangtze and the Han, which meet in Wuhan, the provincial capital.**4** The Three Gorges of the Yangtze, which lie to the west of the province, are an important tourist attraction. However, even though hydroelectricity is an important industry in Hubei, the electricity generated is mainly used to supply eastern provinces such as Shanghai, Zhejiang and Jiangsu. Therefore, many coal-fired electricity power stations and heat power plants have been built in several places in Hubei to meet the demand for electricity and heat. Hubei imports coal from Shanxi, Henan and Nei Menggu (Inner Mongolia) to supply these power stations and plants.

Wuhan, which is situated some 1050 km south of Beijing, is one of China’s largest cities (the 2010 census recorded a population of 6.4 million in its urban area and 9.8 million in its administrative area). Wuhan is a major transportation thoroughfare and the city is the economic hub of central China. It is a centre of higher education and research.

The published input−output tables for Hubei and China in 2007 have the same forty-two sectors, which greatly simplifies the analysis. Even so, there are some noticeable differences in how far Hubei and China specialize in particular industries. This diversity is captured in the SLQs displayed in Table 4.**5** One can see, for example, that Hubei is highly specialized in sectors such as 1, 6 and 39, whereas sectors 2 and 3 are of negligible importance.

**Table 4**

Table 4 shows that the values of *hi* based on Chinese national data exhibit considerable diversity.**6** Six sectors have *hi =* 0.0000, indicating the absence of any cross-hauling (indeed, in most cases, any trade). By contrast, manufacturing sectors 19 and 20 show unusually high values of *hi*; this suggests that the products produced in these sectors are very heterogeneous and that there is much cross-hauling. *hi* is also well above average in other manufacturing sectors such as 12, 16 and 18. Below-average values of *hi* are found especially in service sectors such as 27, 29 and 31. Sector 34 has an atypically high value of *hi* for a service sector but this may reflect the possibility that it is less location-specific than most of the other service sectors. Although the results for China look sensible on the whole, there are many sectors where there are large disparities between the national and regional values of *hi*. This phenomenon is explored later in this paper.

***Estimating Hubei’s imports and exports***

**Table 5**

Table 5 highlights the differences between CHARM and the CB method. A key point is that, with the latter, a positive trade balance, *bi* > 0, yields a corresponding volume of exports but no imports. Conversely, a negative trade balance, *bi* < 0, generates an equivalent amount of imports but no exports. Cross-hauling is precluded by the CB procedure, whereas CHARM takes this common characteristic of regional trade explicitly into account, which is why it yields a greater volume of both exports and imports. This outcome, which is in accordance with the Finnish findings discussed earlier, can be verified from Table 5, where the column sums show that aggregate exports and imports are, respectively, 32% and 50% higher with CHARM. It is also worth noting that the CB method suggests that twenty-five of the forty-two sectors did not import any of their inputs, whereas CHARM finds only five such cases. As regards exports, the CB method classifies seventeen sectors as non-exporters, whereas CHARM identifies only one such case. By comparison, the official data record eight non-exporting and seven non-importing sectors.

Nevertheless, what is most intriguing about the results in Table 5 is that aggregate imports and exports from CHARM are well above the official figures (61% higher for exports and 23% higher for imports). In order to explain these discrepancies, it is helpful to decompose the overall error into three components:

* a *scaling* error due to the use of scaled national data to estimate regional final demand, *fi*, and the residual error, *gi*;
* a *technology* error introduced via the use of national data to estimate regional intermediate transactions, *zi*;
* a *heterogeneity* error brought about by using national data to measure the degree of heterogeneity of products, *hi*.

**Table 6**

From the column sums in Table 6, we can separate out the contribution of each type of error to the overall error. For imports, this process gives:

* scaling error = 347,775 *–* 438,138 = *–*90,363
* technology error = 438,138 *–* 206,145 = 231,993
* heterogeneity error = 206,145 *–* 282,474 = *–*76,329
* overall error = 347,775 *–* 282,474 = 65,301

The corresponding figures for exports are:

* scaling error = 478,459 *–* 305,340 = 173,119
* technology error = 305,340 *–* 220,461 = 84,879
* heterogeneity error = 220,461 *–* 296,790 = *–*76,329
* overall error = 478,459 *–* 296,790 = 181,669

The first point to note is that the heterogeneity error is identical for exports and imports; this error depends solely on the extent to which  and  diverge. It is evident that the key reason for CHARM’s better overall performance in terms of imports is that the scaling error partly offsets the technology error, whereas these two types of error reinforce each other for exports. It is also worth noting that, for imports, technology errors are more serious than scaling errors, whereas the converse is true for exports.

Let us now examine some specific results for imports. In many cases, CHARM’s estimates of imported manufactured goods far exceed the official figures, although the massive shortfall in sector 6 is a striking exception to this pattern. A less extreme shortfall occurs in sector 17. Outside of manufacturing, it is noticeable how CHARM yields absurdly low imports for sector 1, while the only anomalous services sector is 34, where CHARM greatly overstates regional imports.

Table 6 shows the results of using the official regional figures for *fi* and *gi* in place of estimates derived by applying formulae (7) and (8) to scale the national data. The net effect of this change is to raise estimated imports by 26%, from 347,775 to 438,138 million yuan. However, over half of this rise can be traced to sectors 6 and 17. The initial shortfall in imports is largely due to an understatement of final consumption in sector 6 and of gross fixed capital formation in both sectors. Issues of this kind are taken up in the penultimate section of this paper. The use of official data has a big impact in sector 34, cutting its estimated imports by about 25%. Other sectors with pronounced scaling errors include 9, 10, 29 and 31. As expected, scaling errors are negligible for the primary sectors 1 to 5.

Regarding technology errors, Table 6 reveals that the use of official regional intermediate transactions data causes a marked fall in the estimated imports for most manufacturing sectors. Indeed, the upshot of switching from national to regional technology is that aggregate estimated imports fall by 53%, from 438,138 to 206,145 million yuan. This outcome reflects the fact that most sectors in Hubei are more efficient than those in China as a whole, in the sense that they have a lower ratio of intermediate inputs to output. This greater efficiency means that the typical Hubei industry has a lower propensity to import.

The facility to allow for the impact of heterogeneity of products on regional trade is the unique contribution of CHARM, so it is worth exploring this aspect. To do so, it is helpful to substitute equation (9) into (12), so that:

*mi* = ½(|*bi*| + *qi* *–* *bi*), (13)

which gives *mi* = ½*qi* for *bi* > 0 and *mi* = ½*qi* + |*bi*| for *bi* < 0, where *bi* *≡ ei – mi*. Similarly, by substituting equation (9) into (11), we get:

*ei* = ½(|*bi*| + *qi* + *bi*), (14)

which gives *ei* = ½*qi* for *bi* < 0 and *ei* = ½*qi* + *bi* for *bi* > 0. Thus both imports and exports are increasing functions of cross-hauling, *qi*. Also, depending on whether there is a trade deficit (*bi* < 0) or surplus (*bi* > 0), *mi* and *ei* also vary with the trade balance. At this stage, however, since we have eliminated both scaling and technology errors, there is no need to consider errors in *bi* as a possible source of errors in *mi* and *ei*.

Now let us re-examine the anomalous sector 1. Since *bi* > 0, the equation *mi* = ½*qi* applies, so CHARM’s unrealistically low figure for imports must be due to an underestimation of cross-hauling. To demonstrate this, consider the following variant of equation (10), where the estimates of *zi*, *fi* and *gi* have been replaced by official Hubei data:

*qi = hi*(*xi +zi +fi +gi*). (15)

For sector 1, Table 5 gives *xi* = 230,478, while *zi + fi + gi* = *xi* *–* *bi =* 228,621. If we retain CHARM’s assumption of identical regional and national heterogeneity, so that *hi* = 0.0134 (see Table 4), we get *qi =* 0.0134 × 459,099 ≈ 6,152 and *mi =* 0.5 × 6,152 = 3,076. Rounding errors aside, this figure for estimated imports confirms the one given in Table 6. The outcome changes dramatically, however, if we use instead of  (again see Table 4). This region-specific value of *hi* yields *qi =* 0.1603 × 459,099 ≈ 73,594, so that *mi =* 0.5 × 73,594 = 36,797, which accords with the official imports for sector 1.

Sector 6 is another instance where Table 6 records a massive heterogeneity error. However, when a more realistic figure for *hi* is used, namely  rather than , estimated imports rise sharply from 6,599 to 29,921 million yuan, the official value. This sector is unusual since Table 6 also reveals huge scaling and technology errors, yet these errors largely offset each other, so the heterogeneity error essentially determines the overall result. A similar outcome occurs in sector 1 but for a different reason: here the scaling and technology errors are negligible and hence hardly affect the overall error.

By contrast, for sector 19, CHARM’s estimate of imports is 25,743 million yuan above the official figure. This huge gap is due to a scaling error of *–*9,696, a technology error of 24,017 and a heterogeneity error of 11,421. Unlike the previous two examples, however, the heterogeneity error is positive, which reflects the fact that  while 

Let us now consider CHARM’s estimates of exports. Here it is helpful to split the data into two broad groups: sectors 1*–*22 and 23*–*42. This dichotomy reflects the fact that, for the first group, CHARM yields smaller overall errors for exports than for imports for seventeen of the twenty-two sectors. For instance, for sector 6, the overall error is 6,110 for exports but *–*23,892 for imports. By contrast, for the second group, the results are worse for exports in sixteen cases out of twenty. Table 4 shows that this second group spans sectors such as energy, construction, transport and storage, wholesale and retail, hotels, education and public management, whereas the first group is focused on agriculture and manufacturing.

It is striking that CHARM misses the large volume of exports officially recorded for sector 23. As noted earlier, Hubei exports much of its electricity to other provinces and CHARM signally fails to capture this aspect. Table 6 shows very big technology and heterogeneity errors for this sector. By contrast, CHARM greatly overstates the exports of sector 30, owing to large errors of all three types. Furthermore, the official statistics show zero or negligible exports for sectors 26, 33, 39 and 42, yet CHARM indicates substantial exports in each case. These are all regionally based sectors for which one would not expect significant exports. Table 6 records big scaling as well as technology errors for sectors 26, 33 and 39, whereas the problem for sector 42 is almost wholly a scaling issue.

From the above discussion, it is obvious that CHARM’s estimates of exports and imports for individual sectors should be treated with the utmost caution. Its estimates of the exports of the energy, construction and services sectors are especially unreliable. The primary cause of the poor simulations is the difficulty of getting reliable regional data for final demand, intermediate transactions and the degree of heterogeneity of products. Possible ways round this problem are explored in the penultimate section of this paper.

***Estimating supply multipliers for Hubei***

A multiplier is an invaluable tool for evaluating the impact of fluctuations in the demand for the product of a particular regional sector. Indeed, regional analysts may be more interested in obtaining satisfactory estimates of sectoral multipliers than in estimating regional exports and imports. In this study, *supply* rather than *output* multipliers have been computed (Kronenberg, 2012). Supply multipliers measure the impact of changes in final demand on the total supply of commodities rather than on regional output. They are, therefore, useful in environmental assessments, where the focus is on the total supply of a pollutant rather than on where it was produced. A good example here is the coal imported by Hubei to supply its coal-fired power stations and power plants, as mentioned earlier.

The supply multipliers were computed as follows. First, the supply of each industry *j* was calculated by summing the regional output of *j*, *xj*, and the imports of this product, *mj*. Secondly, a set of supply-based regional input coefficients was defined as:

, (16)

where *zij* is the total value of intermediate inputs purchased by industry *j* from sector *i*, inclusive of goods sourced from within Hubei, from other provinces or from abroad. The coefficient matrix corresponding to equation (16) can be written as **Rs** =  Thirdly, the Leontief inverse of **Rs** was derived. This can be expressed as **Ls** =  Lastly, each column of **Ls** was summed to obtain the sectoral supply multiplier, *kj*:

. (17)

The results from each method and the official data are displayed in Table 7.

**Table 7**

The official data yield a mean supply multiplier of 1.919. This figure suggests that a rise in the final demand for Hubei’s industries of one million yuan would raise the total supply of commodities (including products imported from other provinces or from abroad) by 1.919 million yuan on average. CHARM indicates a somewhat higher average rise of 2.078 million, whereas the CB method signals a rise of 2.218 million.

The fact that the CB method invariably produces bigger supply multipliers than CHARM can easily be explained in terms of equation (16): the two methods use identical values for *zij* and *xj* but different values for *mj*. CHARM produces higher imports because it encompasses heterogeneity and thus cross-hauling. Hence the input coefficients and thus supply multipliers from CHARM are lower than those from the CB method.**7**

The disparity between the estimated multipliers from CHARM and the CB method also varies across sectors. This divergence is small for sectors producing relatively homogeneous products, where cross-hauling is apt to be insignificant, such as sector 15. Big differences occur in sectors such as 19 and 20, which have very high values of *hi* and hence exhibit much cross-hauling, especially at the national level (see Table 4). Sectors 2, 3 and 22 are unusual as both methods give multipliers close to the minimum of *kj* = 1; this arises because each sector produces a mere 0.1% of Hubei’s total output (see Table 4), so intermediate transactions are negligible and a very high proportion of supply comes from other regions.**8**

Table 7 reveals that the mean multiplier based on official Hubei data is somewhat lower than CHARM’s estimate. This finding can once again be explained in terms of scaling, technology and heterogeneity errors; on average, these errors cause the multipliers from CHARM to be overstated by 0.066, 0.072 and 0.022, respectively.

The scaling error operates via the term *mj* in equation (16). This error is positive for all but six Hubei sectors, so it tends to lower *mj* for the typical sector and thereby boost *kj*. To illustrate, Table 6 shows that CHARM’s original estimate of imports for sector 6 is 6,029 million yuan, yet when the official Hubei data for final demand and the residual error are used, estimated imports rise to 23,802 million. Table 7 records a scaling error of 0.194, so the extra imports reduce the estimated supply multiplier from 2.529 to 2.335. The result in sector 17 is even more striking: imports rise from 8,536 to 39,327 million yuan and the multiplier falls from 2.771 to 2.216. These two sectors are, however, rather unusual in terms of the size of their scaling errors.

The technology error operates in a more complex way than the scaling error, as it affects both *zij* and *mj* in equation (16). Here we should note that the multipliers from CHARM and those based on the official Hubei statistics use identical values for *xj* but different values, in general, for both *zij* and *mj*. As regards *zij*, it is helpful to examine the ratio which represents the degree of intermediation. With CHARM, the *zij* were calculated using the national technical coefficients and hence reflect the national technology, whereas the official tables for Hubei reflect technology specific to this province. In fact, for thirty-four of the forty-two sectors, CHARM gives higher values for  On average, this ratio is 0.619 for CHARM but 0.553 for the official data. This disparity is a key reason why the multipliers from CHARM exceed those based on the official data.

To assess the impact of technological differences, the multipliers were recalculated by using official data for intermediate inputs instead of data derived by multiplying the known output of each sector by the corresponding national technical coefficient. This substitution affected the multipliers directly via the term *zij* in equation (16) and caused the mean multiplier to fall from 2.078 to 1.823. This fall reflects the fact that Hubei’s industries are typically more economical in their use of intermediate inputs than those in China as a whole.

However, with CHARM, the term *zij* indirectly affects the size of the supply multipliers via its effect on *mj* in equation (16). Imports are affected because a change in *zij* alters the estimated trade balance in equation (5) and the estimate of cross-hauling  in equation (10). When these indirect effects were taken into account, estimated imports fell and the mean multiplier rose from 1.823 to 1.941.

By adding the direct and indirect effects of using the official regional transactions data, we get the technology effect shown in Table 7. Although this effect only slightly exceeds the scaling effect on average, the averaging masks the fact that the nineteen negative values go a long way towards offsetting the twenty-three positive ones. Indeed, when absolute values are taken, the mean technology error rises from 0.072 to 0.167. Moreover, many of the individual errors have a big impact on the estimated multipliers. For instance, those for sectors 15 and 39 are overstated by 0.350 and 0.302, respectively. By contrast, the technology error is small for some key sectors such as 1, 6, 17 and 26. In general, however, CHARM’s use of national technical coefficients greatly impairs the accuracy of its estimates of sectoral supply multipliers.

Finally, we should explore the effects of employing regional rather than national data to capture the heterogeneity of commodities (see Table 4). Using  in equation (10) when estimating cross-hauling boosts imports and hence supply for the average sector; this, in turn, slightly lowers the mean multiplier from 1.941 to 1.919, which is the expected value when all three sources of error are removed. There is little overall impact since nineteen sectors have  nineteen have  and four have  Hence the means are very close, 0.0696 for  and 0.0606 for  while the mean heterogeneity error is only 0.022. However, this unremarkable overall outcome masks some fairly big differences in particular sectors, which reflect divergent values of  and . For instance, for sector 20,  gives *kj* = 1.645, whereas  yields *kj* = 1.834. When absolute values are taken, the mean heterogeneity error rises from 0.022 to 0.059, although this is still well below the mean absolute technology error of 0.167.

6. **ENHANCING CHARM’S PERFORMANCE**

The disappointing results from CHARM for Hubei suggest that we should explore ways of enhancing its performance. The earlier discussion highlighted three key weaknesses: (i) the use of national technical coefficients to represent regional technology; (ii) the errors in scaling final demand; and (iii) the use of national data to measure the heterogeneity of commodities.

A key obstacle encountered when estimating imports, exports and supply multipliers was that the national technical coefficients did not accurately portray the technical requirements of Hubei’s industries, leading to inaccurate estimates of intermediate demand. Productivity in Hubei generally exceeds that in China as a whole, which means that its technical coefficients tend to be smaller than the corresponding national ones. This means, of course, that the proportion of value added − primarily labour costs and profits − tends to be higher in Hubei than in China as a whole. This problem can be addressed, in principle at least, by using Round’s ‘fabrication’ factor (Round, 1972, p. 6).

Round’s approach can be implemented via the following formula:

, (18)

where *w* denotes value added and *x* denotes gross output (cf. Miller and Blair, 2009, pp. 356−357). To illustrate, consider sector 20, where  but . Thus , so that the national technical coefficients in column 20 of Hubei’s matrix would need to be scaled down by a common factor of 0.881, i.e. reduced by 11.9%, to reflect the more economical use of intermediate inputs by sector 20 in Hubei relative to China as a whole. In equation (6),  would need to be replaced by . Such adjustments are easy to implement but they presuppose that the analyst is aware of which regional industries diverge significantly from the national value-added ratios and by how much.**9**

The ratio of total regional to total national output was used to scale national final demand and we now need to consider whether this method could be refined. A possibility in China is to use the ratio of total regional to total national consumption to scale consumption, while retaining the output ratio for the other parts of final demand. These ratios are 0.0379 and 0.0271, respectively, for Hubei. This fresh approach worked well: it cut the overall scaling error for imports from *–*90,363 to *–*60,798 million yuan or, relatively speaking, from *–*20.6% to *–*13.9% (see Table 6). The sectors most affected included 6, 17 and 29.

CHARM assumes that each region has the same pattern of consumption as the nation, so one might ask how realistic this assumption is for Hubei. To explore this issue, the regional sectoral consumption shares were regressed on the corresponding national shares. The resulting equation, , with *R2* = 0.817 and *t* ratios of *–*0.78 and 13.35, suggests that it is not unreasonable to assume an identical pattern of consumption. Similarly, the regional sectoral ratios of gross fixed capital formation to output were regressed on the corresponding national ratios. The resulting equation, , with *R2* = 0.904 and *t* ratios of 1.74 and 19.37, indicates a strong relationship between the regional and national ratios, albeit with some deviation from a 45° line. Taken together, these results offer some support for the refined scaling approach proposed above.**10**

A final source of error was the use of national data to measure the heterogeneity of commodities. Kronenberg (2009, p. 51) justifies the assumption  on the grounds that ‘the heterogeneity of commodity *i* is the same in the region as in the nation’, which he says is reasonable ‘because product heterogeneity is a characteristic of the commodity, not of a specific geographical location.’ While it may well be reasonable to assume that regional and national products exhibit the same degree of heterogeneity, what is more contentious is whether the mix of products in regional and national sectors is sufficiently similar to warrant setting . Jackson (2014) argues, for instance, that this mix is bound to vary across regions; one obvious reason is that not every product included in a national sector would be produced everywhere. He also cites regional differences in tastes and preferences, along with differences in the economic size of regions, as reasons why and are likely to diverge.

Nevertheless, Kronenberg’s assumption does appear to be a reasonable starting point in the case of Hubei. As noted previously, based on official data, the means are very close, 0.0696 for  and 0.0606 for  while the mean heterogeneity error is only 0.022 for the supply multipliers. However, some large errors occurred in particular sectors, for which differences in product mix might be a key explanation. Therefore, national sectors should be scrutinized to see whether their composition is realistic for the region under study. The values of *hi* could then be refined if necessary.

A final way of enhancing CHARM’s performance would be to pursue a hybrid approach, which aims ‘to strike a balance between the accuracy of [a regional input−output] table and the cost of constructing it’ (Kronenberg, 2009, p. 52). Indeed, Kronenberg advocates the use of just such a strategy; more specifically, he recommends making judicious use of superior data from official sources and partial surveys. For instance, analysts might be able to obtain disaggregated data on regional consumption by households, which could be used to improve the estimates of final demand. Also, partial surveys could be carried out of key sectors and important cells in the regional input−output table. Furthermore, Lahr (1993) stresses the importance of obtaining superior data for households and for establishments in resource-based and ‘miscellaneous’ sectors. He singles out agriculture and the extractive industries as cases where a divergence between regional and national technology is very likely to occur.

**7. CONCLUSION**

This paper has employed official data for the Finnish province of Uusimaa and the Chinese province of Hubei to assess the performance of Kronenberg’s CHARM, a new method designed to take explicit account of cross-hauling when constructing regional input−output tables. By adjusting the respective national tables, CHARM was used to simulate the input−output structure of each province.

The case study of Uusimaa produced encouraging results: CHARM performed relatively well in terms of its ability to generate adequate estimates of exports, imports, the volume and balance of trade, and supply multipliers. For instance, on average across the 26 sectors, the unweighted mean supply multiplier from CHARM was 1.542, which is not far above the target figure of 1.482. The results were particularly encouraging for manufacturing sectors, which typically produce heterogeneous commodities and where cross-hauling is rife.

By contrast, CHARM gave unrealistic estimates of Hubei’s sectoral exports and imports, although its estimates of supply multipliers were generally more realistic. Three sources of error in these estimates were identified via a decomposition analysis. These scaling, technology and heterogeneity errors refer to discrepancies introduced by (i) using scaled national data to estimate regional final demand; (ii) adopting national rather than regional technology; and (iii) using national rather than regional values for the heterogeneity parameter, *hi*.

The disappointing outcomes for Hubei can be explained by the difficulty of getting satisfactory estimates of regional technology, heterogeneity and final demand for this data set. This problem is, in turn, linked to the relatively small size of Hubei, which generates around 4% of China’s GDP. By contrast, Uusimaa produced 34.6% of Finland’s national output in 2002. These contrasting findings highlight the crucial importance, especially in relatively small regions, of adjusting for any known divergence between regional and national technology, heterogeneity and the pattern of final demand. As with any non-survey technique, however, CHARM can only be expected to produce an initial set of results, which should then be reviewed by the analyst and suitable adjustments made.

We identified four key ways in which CHARM’s performance might be enhanced. The first was to use Round’s ‘fabrication’ factor to adjust for any known divergence between regional and national technology. Secondly, we investigated some alternative ways of scaling national final demand. This investigation highlighted the importance of scaling final consumption correctly. Thirdly, we examined possible reasons why the national and regional values of *hi* might diverge. Here we recommended that adjustments should be made to allow for any known differences between the sectoral mix of products at the regional and national levels. Lastly, it was suggested that a hybrid approach could be pursued, with judicious use being made of superior data gleaned from official sources and from partial surveys of key regional sectors and important cells in the regional input−output table.

Nonetheless, some basic issues remain to be addressed concerning Kronenberg’s assumption that . For instance, the heterogeneity of products traded internationally might differ from that in interregional trade. More fundamentally, Jackson (2014) suggests that Kronenberg’s formula for estimating cross-hauling is mis-specified in the sense that it presumes that the share of cross-hauling (as measured by *hi*) is invariant across regions. Jackson argues that this share should vary with a region’s economic size. However, the evidence presented here for Hubei suggests that Kronenberg’s assumption does not yield systematically incorrect results, insofar as  on average. Clearly, this issue requires further investigation. In particular, it would be instructive to examine what happens to interregional and international trade as regions get larger and the impact this has on the values of *hi*. Furthermore, Többen and Kronenberg (2015) demonstrate that the original CHARM formula, as discussed in this paper, requires modification if it is to (i) capture cross-hauling in interregional trade and (ii) yield estimates that are consistent with accounting balances. They then specify an appropriately modified formula.

It is worth emphasizing that CHARM is suitable for environmental and other applications where the focus is on the overall supply of goods, regardless of their source. It can only be used in conjunction with type A national tables, where intermediate transactions include imports. By contrast, where the focus is on regional output and employment, the FLQ (Flegg’s location quotient) may be used to generate an initial set of regional input coefficients.**11** However, it requires national transactions matrices that exclude imports (type B tables), which are unavailable for China.**12**

***Footnotes***

1. Source: National Bureau of Statistics of China (2011a).

2. Source: National Bureau of Statistics of China (2009).

3. For more detail on Hubei’s economy, see Hubei Bureau of Statistics (2011).

4. However, this geographic feature has little effect on Hubei’s trading patterns. The Han is mostly used for intra-provincial transportation owing to its limited navigational capacity. Also, cargoes exported by upstream provinces only pass through Hubei along the Yangtze if carried on ships and this activity would not be recorded in Hubei’s exports.

5. The SLQs were computed using the equation:

,

where  is regional output in sector *i* and  is the corresponding national figure.  and  are the respective regional and national totals.

6. For the calculations, the formula was modified to *hi = qi* /*(xi* + z*i* + *fi* + *gi*), where *gi* is the residual error, which arises because national output is unequal to total domestic intermediate and final demand plus net exports or, symbolically, *xi* ≠ z*i* + *fi* + (*ei* − *mi*). To illustrate, consider sector 12, where *qi* = 1,447,584, *xi* = 6,199,809, *zi* = 6,156,694, *fi* = 284,330 and *gi* = −54,490, which gives *hi* *=* 0.1150. For Hubei in 2007, the official data show an overall residual error equal to 1.2% of total output.

7. CHARM and the CB method would produce identical output multipliers because the term *zij* in equation (16) would be the same and *mj* would not be present.

8. According to the official statistics, the ratio  equalled 0.078, 0.054 and 0.139, respectively, for sectors 2, 3 and 22. CHARM gave figures of 0.069, 0.026 and 0.049. Hence it is unsurprising that the multipliers for these sectors are very low.

9. For an application of this approach, using data for Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, see Kronenberg (2010).

10. As another experiment, final consumption was scaled by the ratio of total regional to total national consumption, while sectoral output shares were used for the remaining components. However, this method gave decidedly worse results for manufacturing sectors 16, 18 and 19, along with similar results for most of the remaining sectors.

11. See Bonfiglio and Chelli, 2008; Flegg et al*.*, 1995; Flegg and Tohmo, 2013b, 2014; Flegg and Webber, 1997, 2000; Kowalewski, 2015; Tohmo, 2004.

12. This taxonomy of tables into types A and B follows Kronenberg (2012) and the United Nations (1973). It is possible, however, to make some crude adjustments for ‘competitive’ imports and thereby convert a type A national transactions table into an approximation of a type B table; see Miller and Blair (2009, pp. 149−157).

***References***

Bonfiglio, A. and F. Chelli (2008) Assessing the behaviour of non-survey methods for constructing regional input−output tables through Monte Carlo simulation. *Economic Systems Research*,20**,** 243−258.

Boomsma, P. and J. Oosterhaven (1992) A double-entry method for the construction of bi-regional input−output tables. *Journal of Regional Science*,32**,** 269−284.

Flegg, A.T., Y. Huang and T. Tohmo (2015) Using CHARM to adjust for cross-hauling: the case of the province of Hubei, China, *Economic Systems Research*, 27, 391−413.

Flegg, A.T. and T. Tohmo (2013a) A comment on Tobias Kronenberg’s “Construction of regional input−output tables using nonsurvey methods: the role of cross-hauling”. *International Regional Science Review*, 36, 235−257.

Flegg, A.T. and T. Tohmo (2013b) Regional input−output tables and the FLQ formula: a case study of Finland. *Regional Studies*, 47**,** 703−721.

Flegg, A.T. and T. Tohmo (2016) Estimating regional input coefficients and multipliers: the use of FLQ is not a gamble. *Regional Studies*, 310−325.

Flegg, A.T. and C.D. Webber (1997) On the appropriate use of location quotients in generating regional input−output tables: reply. *Regional Studies*, 31**,** 795−805.

Flegg, A.T. and C.D. Webber (2000) Regional size, regional specialization and the FLQ formula. *Regional Studies*, 34**,** 563−569.

Flegg, A.T., C.D. Webber and M.V. Elliott (1995) On the appropriate use of location quotients in generating regional input−output tables. *Regional Studies*, 29**,** 547−561.

Harrigan, F., J.W. McGilvray and I.H. McNicoll (1981) The estimation of interregional trade flows. *Journal of Regional Science*, 21**,** 65−78.

Hubei Bureau of Statistics (2011) *Hubei Statistical Yearbook 2011*. China Statistics Press, Beijing.

Isard, W. (1953) Regional commodity balances and interregional commodity flows. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 43, 167−180.

Jackson, R.W. (1998) Regionalizing national commodity-by-industry accounts. *Economic Systems Research*,10**,** 223−238.

Jackson, R.W. (2014) Cross-hauling in input−output tables: comments on CHARM. Working Paper 2014-02, Regional Research Institute, West Virginia University, rri.wvu.edu.

Jensen, R.C. (1980) The concept of accuracy in regional input−output models. *International Regional Science Review*,5**,** 139−154.

Kowalewski, J. (2015) Regionalization of national input−output tables: empirical evidence on the use of the FLQ formula. *Regional Studies*, 240−250.

Kronenberg, T. (2009) Construction of regional input−output tables using nonsurvey methods: the role of cross-hauling. *International Regional Science Review*,32**,** 40−64.

Kronenberg, T. (2010) Erstellung einer input-output-tabelle für Mecklenburg-Vorpommern. *AStA Wirtschafts- und Sozialstatistisches Archiv*, 4, 223−248.

Kronenberg, T. (2012) Regional input−output models and the treatment of imports in the European system of accounts. *Jahrbuch für Regionalwissenschaft (Review of Regional Research)*, 32**,** 175−191.

Kronenberg, T. and J. Többen (2013) Über die Erstellung regionaler Input-Output-Tabellen und die Verbuchung von Importen. In IWH (ed.), Neuere Anwendungsfelder der Input-Output-Analyse. Beiträge zum Halleschen Input-Output-Workshop 2012, Halle (Saale).

Lahr, M.L. (1993) A review of the literature supporting the hybrid approach to constructing regional input−output models. *Economic Systems Research*,5**,** 277−293.

Lahr, M.L. (2001) Reconciling domestication techniques, the notion of re-exports and some comments on regional accounting. *Economic Systems Research*,13**,** 165−179.

Miller, R. E. and P.D. Blair (2009) *Input−Output Analysis: Foundations and Extensions*, 2nd edition. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

National Bureau of Statistics of China (2009) *China Statistical Yearbook 2008*. China Statistics Press, Beijing.

National Bureau of Statistics of China (2011a) *China Statistical Yearbook 2011*. China Statistics Press, Beijing.

National Bureau of Statistics of China (2011b) *Chinese National and Regional Input−Output Tables 2007*. China Statistics Press, Beijing.

Richardson, H.W. (1985) Input−output and economic base multipliers: looking backward and foreward. *Journal of Regional Science*,25**,** 607−661.


Robison, M.H. and J.R. Miller (1988) Cross-hauling and nonsurvey input−output models: some lessons from small-area timber economies. *Environment and Planning A*,20**,** 1523−1530.

Round, J.I. (1972) Regional input−output models in the U.K.: a reappraisal of some techniques. *Regional Studies*, 6**,** 1−9.

Többen, J. and T. Kronenberg (2015) The application of CHARM to multi-regional input−output tables, *Economic Systems Research*, 27, 487−507.

Tohmo, T. (2004) New developments in the use of location quotients to estimate regional input−output coefficients and multipliers. *Regional Studies*, 38**,** 43−54.

United Nations (1973) *Input−Output Tables and Analysis*. United Nations, New York.

****

**Figure 1.**  Estimates of Uusimaa’s Imports from CHARM and the CB method

**TABLE 1.** Employees in Uusimaa and Finland by regional sector

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | Description | Uusimaa:  Employees | Finland:  Employees | Regional  share (%) | National  share (%) | SLQi |
| 1 | Agriculture and hunting (1) | 3,409 | 104,000 | 0.5 | 4.4 | 0.104 |
| 2 | Forestry and logging (2) | 1,105 | 20,000 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 0.176 |
| 3 | Fishing (3) | 37 | 2,000 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.059 |
| 4 | Mining and extraction (4−8) | 635 | 6,000 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.336 |
| 5 | Manufacture of food products, beverages and tobacco products (9−10) | 9,462 | 41,000 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 0.733 |
| 6 | Manufacture of textiles and clothes; dressing and dyeing of fur; tanning and dressing of leather; manufacture of luggage, handbags, saddlery, harness and footwear (11−13) | 1,754 | 19,000 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.293 |
| 7 | Manufacture of wood and of products of wood and cork, except furniture; manufacture of articles of straw and plaiting materials (14) | 1,576 | 31,000 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.162 |
| 8 | Manufacture of pulp, paper and paper products; publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media (15−16) | 18,009 | 72,000 | 2.4 | 3.1 | 0.795 |
| 9 | Manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products, nuclear fuels, chemicals and chemical products, rubber and plastic products (17−19) | 9,127 | 40,000 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.725 |
| 10 | Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products (20) | 2,964 | 16,000 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.589 |
| 11 | Manufacture of basic metals and fabricated metal products, other than machinery and equipment (21−22) | 8,191 | 62,000 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 0.420 |
| 12 | Manufacture of machinery and equipment not classified elsewhere (23) | 10,460 | 63,000 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 0.527 |
| 13 | Manufacture of office machinery and computers; electrical machinery and apparatus; radio, television and communication equipment and apparatus; medical, precision and optical instruments, watches and clocks (24−27) | 26,823 | 66,000 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 1.291 |
| 14 | Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers, semi-trailers and other transport equipment (28−29) | 5,986 | 25,000 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.761 |
| 15 | Manufacture of furniture; manufacturing not classified elsewhere; recycling (30−31) | 2,924 | 19,000 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.489 |
| 16 | Electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply; collection, purification and distribution of water (32−33) | 4,915 | 16,000 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.976 |
| 17 | Construction (34) | 42,555 | 155,000 | 5.8 | 6.6 | 0.872 |
| 18 | Sale, maintenance and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles; retail of automotive fuel; wholesale, retail and commission trade, excluding motor vehicles and motorcycles; repair of personal and household goods (35−37) | 122,176 | 300,000 | 16.5 | 12.8 | 1.294 |
| 19 | Hotels and restaurants (38) | 27,228 | 77,000 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 1.123 |
| 20 | Land, water and air transport; travel agencies; post and telecommunications (39−43) | 66,325 | 174,000 | 9.0 | 7.4 | 1.211 |
| 21 | Financial intermediation; insurance and pension funding, except for compulsory social security (44−46) | 20,733 | 41,000 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 1.606 |
| 22 | Real estate and other business activities; rental of machinery and equipment and of personal and household goods; research and development (47−51) | 114,585 | 236,000 | 15.5 | 10.0 | 1.542 |
| 23 | Public administration and defence; compulsory social security (52) | 52,838 | 173,000 | 7.1 | 7.4 | 0.970 |
| 24 | Education (53) | 50,405 | 157,000 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 1.020 |
| 25 | Health and social work (54) | 88,539 | 321,000 | 12.0 | 13.7 | 0.876 |
| 26 | Sewage and refuse disposal, sanitation and similar activities; recreational, cultural, sporting and other service activities; private households with employed persons (55−59) | 46,665 | 113,000 | 6.3 | 4.8 | 1.312 |
| Sum |  | 739,426 | 2,349,000 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

*Note:* The corresponding 59 national sectors are shown in brackets.

**TABLE 2.** Estimation of Uusimaa trade (millions of euros)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | CHARM | | | | Commodity Balance | | | | Benchmark | | | | |
| Exports | Imports | Trade  balance | Trade  volume | Exports | Imports | Trade  balance | Trade  volume | Exports | Imports | Trade  balance | Trade  volume | Output |
| 1 | 50.1 | 889.2 | −839.1 | 939.3 | 0.0 | 839.1 | −839.1 | 839.1 | 146 | 838 | −692 | 984 | 182 |
| 2 | 4.9 | 358.3 | −353.4 | 363.1 | 0.0 | 353.4 | −353.4 | 353.4 | 43 | 165 | −122 | 208 | 131 |
| 3 | 0.4 | 48.7 | −48.3 | 49.1 | 0.0 | 48.3 | −48.3 | 48.3 | 1 | 47 | −46 | 48 | 13 |
| 4 | 22.9 | 979.8 | −956.9 | 1,002.7 | 0.0 | 956.9 | −956.9 | 956.9 | 26 | 888 | −862 | 914 | 138 |
| 5 | 279.3 | 984.9 | −705.6 | 1,264.2 | 0.0 | 705.6 | −705.6 | 705.6 | 1,826 | 2,131 | −305 | 3,957 | 2,134 |
| 6 | 173.4 | 775.5 | −602.1 | 948.9 | 0.0 | 602.1 | −602.1 | 602.1 | 122 | 730 | −608 | 852 | 144 |
| 7 | 35.8 | 458.8 | −423.0 | 494.6 | 0.0 | 423.0 | −423.0 | 423.0 | 148 | 515 | −367 | 663 | 208 |
| 8 | 2,190.9 | 216.4 | 1,974.5 | 2,407.4 | 1,974.5 | 0.0 | 1,974.5 | 1,974.5 | 2,140 | 1,682 | 458 | 3,822 | 3,329 |
| 9 | 1,434.4 | 2,069.4 | −635.0 | 3,503.8 | 0.0 | 635.0 | −635.0 | 635.0 | 1,856 | 2,371 | −515 | 4,227 | 2,424 |
| 10 | 95.3 | 216.5 | −121.2 | 311.8 | 0.0 | 121.2 | −121.2 | 121.2 | 247 | 417 | −170 | 664 | 471 |
| 11 | 451.2 | 889.6 | −438.4 | 1,340.8 | 0.0 | 438.4 | −438.4 | 438.4 | 808 | 1,411 | −603 | 2,219 | 1,106 |
| 12 | 749.6 | 1,132.8 | −383.2 | 1,882.4 | 0.0 | 383.2 | −383.2 | 383.2 | 1,392 | 1,764 | −372 | 3,156 | 1,938 |
| 13 | 6,944.5 | 3,250.1 | 3,694.4 | 10,194.6 | 3,694.4 | 0.0 | 3,694.4 | 3,694.4 | 7,367 | 4,883 | 2,484 | 12,250 | 8,979 |
| 14 | 832.5 | 1,234.3 | −401.9 | 2,066.8 | 0.0 | 401.9 | −401.9 | 401.9 | 941 | 1,260 | −319 | 2,201 | 894 |
| 15 | 115.1 | 424.4 | −309.3 | 539.5 | 0.0 | 309.3 | −309.3 | 309.3 | 234 | 566 | −332 | 800 | 305 |
| 16 | 63.7 | 124.5 | −60.8 | 188.2 | 0.0 | 60.8 | −60.8 | 60.8 | 188 | 88 | 100 | 276 | 1,593 |
| 17 | 0.0 | 1,175.5 | −1,175.5 | 1,175.5 | 0.0 | 1,175.5 | −1,175.5 | 1,175.5 | 387 | 224 | 163 | 611 | 6,311 |
| 18 | 2,562.5 | 159.1 | 2,403.4 | 2,721.6 | 2,403.4 | 0.0 | 2,403.4 | 2,403.4 | 4,441 | 140 | 4,301 | 4,581 | 12,906 |
| 19 | 28.9 | 61.5 | −32.6 | 90.3 | 0.0 | 32.6 | −32.6 | 32.6 | 170 | 206 | −36 | 376 | 1,759 |
| 20 | 2,239.5 | 602.9 | 1,636.5 | 2,842.4 | 1,636.5 | 0.0 | 1,636.5 | 1,636.5 | 4,441 | 2,108 | 2,333 | 6,549 | 10,808 |
| 21 | 1,104.9 | 50.6 | 1,054.3 | 1,155.5 | 1,054.3 | 0.0 | 1,054.3 | 1,054.3 | 1,229 | 177 | 1,052 | 1,406 | 3,845 |
| 22 | 4,838.0 | 586.8 | 4,251.2 | 5,424.8 | 4,251.2 | 0.0 | 4,251.2 | 4,251.2 | 4,780 | 1,601 | 3,179 | 6,381 | 16,476 |
| 23 | 34.9 | 184.2 | −149.3 | 219.2 | 0.0 | 149.3 | −149.3 | 149.3 | 213 | 169 | 44 | 382 | 3,889 |
| 24 | 7.0 | 1.3 | 5.7 | 8.3 | 5.7 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 5.7 | 32 | 47 | −15 | 79 | 2,410 |
| 25 | 0.4 | 538.7 | −538.3 | 539.1 | 0.0 | 538.3 | −538.3 | 538.3 | 107 | 44 | 63 | 151 | 4,115 |
| 26 | 662.3 | 40.1 | 622.2 | 702.5 | 622.2 | 0.0 | 622.2 | 622.2 | 790 | 145 | 645 | 935 | 3,843 |
| Sum | 24,922.4 | 17,454.0 | 7,468.4 | 42,376.4 | 15,642.3 | 8,174.0 | 7,468.4 | 23,816.3 | 34,075 | 24,617 | 9,458 | 58,692 | 90,351 |

**TABLE 3.** Estimates of supply multipliers and trade volume for the CB method and CHARM (employment-based)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | Description | Supply multipliers | | | Ratio of estimated to target trade volume | |
| Survey | CHARM | CB | CHARM | CB |
| 1 | Agriculture and hunting | 1.171 | 1.127 | 1.143 | 0.955 | 0.853 |
| 2 | Forestry and logging | 1.238 | 1.116 | 1.123 | 1.746 | 1.699 |
| 3 | Fishing | 1.025 | 1.030 | 1.032 | 1.024 | 1.006 |
| 4 | Mining and extraction | 1.153 | 1.100 | 1.110 | 1.097 | 1.047 |
| 5 | Manufacture of food products, beverages and tobacco products | 1.536 | 1.827 | 1.968 | 0.319 | 0.178 |
| 6 | Manufacture of textiles and clothes; dressing and dyeing of fur; tanning and dressing of leather; manufacture of luggage, handbags, saddlery, harness and footwear | 1.139 | 1.130 | 1.173 | 1.114 | 0.707 |
| 7 | Manufacture of wood and of products of wood and cork, except furniture; manufacture of articles of straw and plaiting materials | 1.262 | 1.392 | 1.432 | 0.746 | 0.638 |
| 8 | Manufacture of pulp, paper and paper products; publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media | 1.657 | 2.045 | 2.176 | 0.630 | 0.517 |
| 9 | Manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products, nuclear fuels, chemicals and chemical products, rubber and plastic products | 1.478 | 1.575 | 1.917 | 0.829 | 0.150 |
| 10 | Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products | 1.479 | 1.632 | 1.817 | 0.470 | 0.182 |
| 11 | Manufacture of basic metals and fabricated metal products, other than machinery and equipment | 1.404 | 1.691 | 1.968 | 0.604 | 0.198 |
| 12 | Manufacture of machinery and equipment not classified elsewhere | 1.581 | 1.710 | 2.115 | 0.596 | 0.121 |
| 13 | Manufacture of office machinery and computers; electrical machinery and apparatus; radio, television and communication equipment and apparatus; medical, precision and optical instruments, watches and clocks | 1.634 | 1.754 | 2.235 | 0.832 | 0.302 |
| 14 | Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers, semi-trailers and other transport equipment | 1.442 | 1.531 | 2.003 | 0.939 | 0.183 |
| 15 | Manufacture of furniture; manufacturing not classified elsewhere; recycling | 1.307 | 1.389 | 1.509 | 0.674 | 0.387 |
| 16 | Electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply; collection, purification and distribution of water | 1.612 | 1.619 | 1.692 | 0.682 | 0.220 |
| 17 | Construction | 2.001 | 1.842 | 1.925 | 1.924 | 1.924 |
| 18 | Sale, maintenance and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles; retail of automotive fuel; wholesale, retail and commission trade, excluding motor vehicles and motorcycles; repair of personal and household goods | 1.735 | 1.773 | 1.839 | 0.594 | 0.525 |
| 19 | Hotels and restaurants | 1.816 | 1.850 | 1.917 | 0.240 | 0.087 |
| 20 | Land, water and air transport; travel agencies; post and telecommunications | 1.529 | 1.774 | 1.885 | 0.434 | 0.250 |
| 21 | Financial intermediation; insurance and pension funding, except for compulsory social security | 1.519 | 1.494 | 1.532 | 0.822 | 0.750 |
| 22 | Real estate and other business activities; rental of machinery and equipment and of personal and household goods; research and development | 1.630 | 1.591 | 1.649 | 0.850 | 0.666 |
| 23 | Public administration and defence; compulsory social security | 1.631 | 1.600 | 1.654 | 0.574 | 0.391 |
| 24 | Education | 1.439 | 1.435 | 1.460 | 0.105 | 0.072 |
| 25 | Health and social work | 1.404 | 1.374 | 1.399 | 3.570 | 3.565 |
| 26 | Sewage and refuse disposal, sanitation and similar activities; recreational, cultural, sporting and other service activities; private households with employed persons | 1.711 | 1.699 | 1.747 | 0.751 | 0.665 |
|  | Mean | 1.482 | 1.542 | 1.670 | 0.889 | 0.665 |
|  | Mean (excluding sectors 2, 17 and 25) | 1.473 | 1.555 | 1.694 | 0.691 | 0.439 |
|  | Mean proportional error (%) |  | 3.958 | 12.360 |  |  |

TABLE 4. Sectoral shares of output and heterogeneity of products in 2007: Province of Hubei and China

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | Description | Share of output | | *SLQi* | Degree of heterogeneity (*hi*) | |
| Hubei | China | China | Hubei |
| 1 | Agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry and fishing | 0.104 | 0.060 | 1.740 | 0.0134 | 0.1603 |
| 2 | Coal mining and washing | 0.001 | 0.012 | 0.096 | 0.0200 | 0.0008 |
| 3 | Oil and gas mining | 0.001 | 0.012 | 0.068 | 0.0141 | 0.0120 |
| 4 | Metal mining and selecting | 0.004 | 0.008 | 0.534 | 0.0101 | 0.5963 |
| 5 | Mining and selecting of non-metalliferous ore and other minerals | 0.008 | 0.005 | 1.789 | 0.0383 | 0.0682 |
| 6 | Food manufacturing and tobacco processing | 0.081 | 0.051 | 1.580 | 0.0380 | 0.1723 |
| 7 | Textile industry | 0.036 | 0.031 | 1.168 | 0.0381 | 0.0908 |
| 8 | Manufacturing of textile clothing, shoes, hats, leather and down | 0.024 | 0.022 | 1.102 | 0.0392 | 0.0136 |
| 9 | Wood processing and furniture manufacturing | 0.011 | 0.013 | 0.798 | 0.0273 | 0.0377 |
| 10 | Paper, printing, stationery and sporting goods | 0.018 | 0.018 | 0.973 | 0.0583 | 0.0177 |
| 11 | Oil processing, coking and nuclear fuel processing | 0.013 | 0.026 | 0.488 | 0.0359 | 0.0055 |
| 12 | Chemical industry | 0.057 | 0.076 | 0.755 | 0.1150 | 0.0948 |
| 13 | Manufacturing of non-metallic minerals | 0.033 | 0.028 | 1.170 | 0.0170 | 0.0594 |
| 14 | Metal smelting and press processing | 0.045 | 0.075 | 0.600 | 0.0712 | 0.1452 |
| 15 | Fabricated metal products | 0.024 | 0.022 | 1.098 | 0.0361 | 0.0382 |
| 16 | Manufacturing of general and special equipment | 0.035 | 0.048 | 0.730 | 0.1429 | 0.1411 |
| 17 | Manufacturing of transportation equipment | 0.043 | 0.040 | 1.063 | 0.0915 | 0.2078 |
| 18 | Manufacturing of electrical machinery and equipment | 0.013 | 0.033 | 0.391 | 0.1349 | 0.0870 |
| 19 | Manufacturing of communication equipment, computers and other electronic equipment | 0.019 | 0.050 | 0.369 | 0.4217 | 0.1571 |
| 20 | Manufacturing of instruments, equipment for cultural industries, and office machinery | 0.004 | 0.006 | 0.692 | 0.6195 | 0.2349 |
| 21 | Arts, crafts and other manufacturing | 0.005 | 0.008 | 0.650 | 0.0393 | 0.0126 |
| 22 | Waste and scrap | 0.001 | 0.005 | 0.237 | 0.0063 | 0.0282 |
| 23 | Electric power, heat power production and supply | 0.030 | 0.038 | 0.779 | 0.0006 | 0.1537 |
| 24 | Gas production and supply | 0.004 | 0.001 | 3.237 | 0.0000 | 0.0023 |
| 25 | Water production and supply | 0.003 | 0.001 | 2.322 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 26 | Construction | 0.089 | 0.077 | 1.157 | 0.0035 | 0.0000 |
| 27 | Transport and storage | 0.045 | 0.039 | 1.174 | 0.0352 | 0.0645 |
| 28 | Post | 0.001 | 0.001 | 1.380 | 0.0560 | 0.0227 |
| 29 | Information transmission, computer services and software | 0.013 | 0.012 | 1.071 | 0.0399 | 0.0480 |
| 30 | Wholesale and retail trade | 0.046 | 0.035 | 1.314 | 0.0000 | 0.0548 |
| 31 | Hotels and catering services | 0.025 | 0.018 | 1.359 | 0.0356 | 0.0128 |
| 32 | Financial intermediation | 0.023 | 0.024 | 0.981 | 0.0044 | 0.0236 |
| 33 | Real estate | 0.025 | 0.018 | 1.366 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 34 | Leasing and business services | 0.011 | 0.014 | 0.754 | 0.2118 | 0.0245 |
| 35 | Research and development | 0.002 | 0.002 | 1.118 | 0.0155 | 0.0230 |
| 36 | Comprehensive technology services | 0.004 | 0.005 | 0.783 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 37 | Management of water conservancy, environment and public facilities | 0.003 | 0.003 | 1.288 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |
| 38 | Services to households and other services | 0.013 | 0.011 | 1.234 | 0.0232 | 0.0000 |
| 39 | Education | 0.031 | 0.016 | 1.912 | 0.0020 | 0.0118 |
| 40 | Health, social security and social welfare | 0.017 | 0.014 | 1.249 | 0.0018 | 0.0000 |
| 41 | Culture, sports and entertainment | 0.006 | 0.004 | 1.360 | 0.0860 | 0.0025 |
| 42 | Public management and social organization | 0.030 | 0.019 | 1.553 | 0.0027 | 0.0000 |
|  | Sum or mean | 1.000 | 1.000 |  | 0.0606 | 0.0696 |

*Source:* Authors’ calculations using data from the official input−output tables for China and Hubei in 2007 (National Bureau of Statistics of China, 2011b).

**TABLE 5**. Estimation of Hubei trade (millions of yuan) in 2007

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | CHARM | | | | CB method | | | | Official statistics | | | | |
| Exports | Imports | Trade balance | Trade volume | Exports | Imports | Trade balance | Trade volume | Exports | Imports | Trade balance | Trade volume | Output |
| 1 | 55938 | 2731 | 53207 | 58669 | 53207 | 0 | 53207 | 53207 | 38654 | 36797 | 1857 | 75451 | 230478 |
| 2 | 220 | 17205 | −16985 | 17424 | 0 | 16985 | −16985 | 16985 | 8 | 16287 | −16279 | 16295 | 2520 |
| 3 | 198 | 24776 | −24578 | 24973 | 0 | 24578 | −24578 | 24578 | 111 | 15134 | −15023 | 15245 | 1745 |
| 4 | 131 | 8193 | −8062 | 8324 | 0 | 8062 | −8062 | 8062 | 7164 | 13395 | −6230 | 20559 | 8901 |
| 5 | 7634 | 580 | 7054 | 8214 | 7054 | 0 | 7054 | 7054 | 1790 | 1255 | 535 | 3045 | 18667 |
| 6 | 46355 | 6029 | 40326 | 52383 | 40326 | 0 | 40326 | 40326 | 40245 | 29921 | 10325 | 70166 | 178833 |
| 7 | 28551 | 2539 | 26012 | 31090 | 26012 | 0 | 26012 | 26012 | 21545 | 6555 | 14990 | 28099 | 79711 |
| 8 | 19090 | 1774 | 17315 | 20864 | 17315 | 0 | 17315 | 17315 | 8460 | 683 | 7777 | 9143 | 53953 |
| 9 | 736 | 647 | 89 | 1383 | 89 | 0 | 89 | 89 | 913 | 1892 | −978 | 2805 | 23761 |
| 10 | 2513 | 2288 | 225 | 4801 | 225 | 0 | 225 | 225 | 743 | 8806 | −8063 | 9549 | 39367 |
| 11 | 1483 | 28522 | −27039 | 30005 | 0 | 27039 | −27039 | 27039 | 204 | 19140 | −18935 | 19344 | 27835 |
| 12 | 16554 | 50965 | −34411 | 67518 | 0 | 34411 | −34411 | 34411 | 12557 | 24118 | −11561 | 36675 | 126726 |
| 13 | 9820 | 1152 | 8669 | 10972 | 8669 | 0 | 8669 | 8669 | 11501 | 4069 | 7432 | 15569 | 72267 |
| 14 | 7924 | 32013 | −24089 | 39937 | 0 | 24089 | −24089 | 24089 | 17098 | 14198 | 2900 | 31296 | 99239 |
| 15 | 19165 | 1581 | 17584 | 20746 | 17584 | 0 | 17584 | 17584 | 12873 | 1799 | 11074 | 14672 | 52654 |
| 16 | 12646 | 33332 | −20685 | 45978 | 0 | 20685 | −20685 | 20685 | 11236 | 14201 | −2966 | 25437 | 78141 |
| 17 | 11811 | 8536 | 3275 | 20347 | 3275 | 0 | 3275 | 3275 | 20013 | 22647 | −2635 | 42660 | 94972 |
| 18 | 5568 | 30714 | −25145 | 36282 | 0 | 25145 | −25145 | 25145 | 2581 | 4510 | −1929 | 7090 | 28697 |
| 19 | 20695 | 36438 | −15743 | 57133 | 0 | 15743 | −15743 | 15743 | 6780 | 10695 | −3915 | 17475 | 41205 |
| 20 | 7154 | 11963 | −4809 | 19117 | 0 | 4809 | −4809 | 4809 | 2508 | 5571 | −3063 | 8078 | 9143 |
| 21 | 470 | 2606 | −2136 | 3077 | 0 | 2136 | −2136 | 2136 | 604 | 134 | 470 | 738 | 10883 |
| 22 | 43 | 8162 | −8118 | 8205 | 0 | 8118 | −8118 | 8118 | 404 | 356 | 48 | 760 | 2799 |
| 23 | 40 | 7046 | −7006 | 7086 | 0 | 7006 | −7006 | 7006 | 27526 | 8777 | 18749 | 36303 | 66487 |
| 24 | 6598 | 0 | 6598 | 6598 | 6598 | 0 | 6598 | 6598 | 2742 | 20 | 2722 | 2761 | 9719 |
| 25 | 4057 | 0 | 4057 | 4057 | 4057 | 0 | 4057 | 4057 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7416 |
| 26 | 26521 | 649 | 25872 | 27170 | 25872 | 0 | 25872 | 25872 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196670 |
| 27 | 22415 | 3207 | 19209 | 25622 | 19209 | 0 | 19209 | 19209 | 20636 | 6027 | 14610 | 26663 | 100810 |
| 28 | 542 | 142 | 400 | 684 | 400 | 0 | 400 | 400 | 66 | 418 | −352 | 484 | 2733 |
| 29 | 2428 | 1135 | 1294 | 3563 | 1294 | 0 | 1294 | 1294 | 1410 | 1995 | −585 | 3405 | 29105 |
| 30 | 35899 | 0 | 35899 | 35899 | 35899 | 0 | 35899 | 35899 | 15961 | 5336 | 10625 | 21297 | 102634 |
| 31 | 13693 | 1727 | 11966 | 15420 | 11966 | 0 | 11966 | 11966 | 4446 | 676 | 3770 | 5122 | 54532 |
| 32 | 234 | 2314 | −2081 | 2548 | 0 | 2081 | −2081 | 2081 | 1386 | 1220 | 166 | 2606 | 51771 |
| 33 | 13498 | 0 | 13498 | 13498 | 13498 | 0 | 13498 | 13498 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54679 |
| 34 | 5915 | 13615 | −7700 | 19530 | 0 | 7700 | −7700 | 7700 | 1477 | 580 | 897 | 2057 | 24080 |
| 35 | 70 | 759 | −689 | 829 | 0 | 689 | −689 | 689 | 114 | 1646 | −1532 | 1759 | 4176 |
| 36 | 0 | 2481 | −2481 | 2481 | 0 | 2481 | −2481 | 2481 | 0 | 2702 | −2702 | 2702 | 9329 |
| 37 | 1229 | 0 | 1229 | 1229 | 1229 | 0 | 1229 | 1229 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7528 |
| 38 | 4663 | 633 | 4030 | 5296 | 4030 | 0 | 4030 | 4030 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29263 |
| 39 | 31031 | 103 | 30928 | 31134 | 30928 | 0 | 30928 | 30928 | 3003 | 788 | 2215 | 3791 | 67693 |
| 40 | 7624 | 61 | 7562 | 7685 | 7562 | 0 | 7562 | 7562 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37645 |
| 41 | 3563 | 1013 | 2550 | 4575 | 2550 | 0 | 2550 | 2550 | 32 | 129 | −97 | 162 | 13048 |
| 42 | 23741 | 145 | 23596 | 23886 | 23596 | 0 | 23596 | 23596 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66554 |
| Sum | 478459 | 347775 | 130685 | 826234 | 362444 | 231759 | 130685 | 594203 | 296790 | 282474 | 14316 | 579264 | 2218368 |

*Source:* See Table 4.

**TABLE 6.** The impact on the estimates from CHARM of using official Hubei data (millions of yuan) in 2007

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | Imports | | | | | | | Exports | | | | | | |
| Original CHARM estimates | Using official *fi* and *gi* | Using official *fi*, *gi* and *zi* | Scaling error | Technology error | Heterogeneity error | Official data for imports | Original CHARM estimates | Using official *fi* and *gi* | Using official *fi*, *gi* and *zi* | Scaling error | Technology error | Heterogeneity error | Official data for exports |
| 1 | 2731 | 2943 | 3074 | −212 | −132 | −33723 | 36797 | 55938 | 24492 | 4931 | 31446 | 19561 | −33723 | 38654 |
| 2 | 17205 | 17748 | 16492 | −543 | 1257 | 205 | 16287 | 220 | 225 | 213 | −5 | 12 | 205 | 8 |
| 3 | 24776 | 24887 | 15153 | −111 | 9734 | 19 | 15134 | 198 | 198 | 130 | 0 | 68 | 19 | 111 |
| 4 | 8193 | 8001 | 6352 | 192 | 1649 | −7043 | 13395 | 131 | 130 | 121 | 1 | 8 | −7043 | 7164 |
| 5 | 580 | 596 | 705 | −16 | −109 | −550 | 1255 | 7634 | 6828 | 1240 | 806 | 5588 | −550 | 1790 |
| 6 | 6029 | 23802 | 6599 | −17773 | 17204 | −23322 | 29921 | 46355 | 7112 | 16923 | 39243 | −9812 | −23322 | 40245 |
| 7 | 2539 | 2875 | 2749 | −336 | 126 | −3806 | 6555 | 28551 | 11244 | 17739 | 17307 | −6495 | −3806 | 21545 |
| 8 | 1774 | 2004 | 1961 | −230 | 43 | 1278 | 683 | 19090 | 7606 | 9738 | 11484 | −2133 | 1278 | 8460 |
| 9 | 647 | 7372 | 1640 | −6725 | 5733 | −252 | 1892 | 736 | 739 | 661 | −3 | 77 | −252 | 913 |
| 10 | 2288 | 6956 | 10593 | −4668 | 3637 | 1787 | 8806 | 2513 | 2427 | 2530 | 86 | −103 | 1787 | 743 |
| 11 | 28522 | 30200 | 20273 | −1678 | 9928 | 1133 | 19140 | 1483 | 1512 | 1337 | −29 | 175 | 1133 | 204 |
| 12 | 50965 | 62815 | 26801 | −11850 | 36015 | 2683 | 24118 | 16554 | 17198 | 15240 | −644 | 1958 | 2683 | 12557 |
| 13 | 1152 | 1199 | 1162 | −47 | 37 | −2906 | 4069 | 9820 | 4284 | 8595 | 5536 | −4311 | −2906 | 11501 |
| 14 | 32013 | 33986 | 6963 | −1973 | 27023 | −7235 | 14198 | 7924 | 7992 | 9863 | −68 | −1872 | −7235 | 17098 |
| 15 | 1581 | 1626 | 1699 | −45 | −72 | −100 | 1799 | 19165 | 16708 | 12772 | 2457 | 3936 | −100 | 12873 |
| 16 | 33332 | 38569 | 14346 | −5237 | 24224 | 144 | 14201 | 12646 | 12996 | 11380 | −350 | 1616 | 144 | 11236 |
| 17 | 8536 | 39327 | 11441 | −30791 | 27887 | −11207 | 22647 | 11811 | 10025 | 8806 | 1786 | 1219 | −11207 | 20013 |
| 18 | 30714 | 22927 | 5931 | 7787 | 16996 | 1422 | 4510 | 5568 | 5076 | 4002 | 492 | 1074 | 1422 | 2581 |
| 19 | 36438 | 46134 | 22117 | −9696 | 24017 | 11421 | 10695 | 20695 | 22383 | 18201 | −1688 | 4182 | 11421 | 6780 |
| 20 | 11963 | 13434 | 9676 | −1471 | 3758 | 4105 | 5571 | 7154 | 7502 | 6613 | −348 | 889 | 4105 | 2508 |
| 21 | 2606 | 372 | 419 | 2234 | −47 | 285 | 134 | 470 | 3232 | 889 | −2762 | 2343 | 285 | 604 |
| 22 | 8162 | 7561 | 17 | 601 | 7543 | −338 | 356 | 43 | 41 | 66 | 2 | −24 | −338 | 404 |
| 23 | 7046 | 9912 | 33 | −2866 | 9879 | −8744 | 8777 | 40 | 41 | 18781 | −1 | −18740 | −8744 | 27526 |
| 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | −20 | 20 | 6598 | 4469 | 2722 | 2129 | 1747 | −20 | 2742 |
| 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4057 | 2758 | 0 | 1299 | 2758 | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | 649 | 662 | 695 | −13 | −32 | 695 | 0 | 26521 | 18981 | 695 | 7540 | 18286 | 695 | 0 |
| 27 | 3207 | 3380 | 3287 | −173 | 92 | −2739 | 6027 | 22415 | 12744 | 17897 | 9671 | −5153 | −2739 | 20636 |
| 28 | 142 | 141 | 515 | 1 | −374 | 97 | 418 | 542 | 566 | 163 | −24 | 404 | 97 | 66 |
| 29 | 1135 | 6448 | 1757 | −5313 | 4690 | −238 | 1995 | 2428 | 1264 | 1172 | 1164 | 92 | −238 | 1410 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | −5336 | 5336 | 35899 | 22039 | 10625 | 13860 | 11414 | −5336 | 15961 |
| 31 | 1727 | 5543 | 1873 | −3816 | 3670 | 1197 | 676 | 13693 | 2003 | 5643 | 11690 | −3640 | 1197 | 4446 |
| 32 | 2314 | 4475 | 229 | −2161 | 4246 | −991 | 1220 | 234 | 238 | 395 | −4 | −157 | −991 | 1386 |
| 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13498 | 27834 | 0 | −14336 | 27834 | 0 | 0 |
| 34 | 13615 | 10265 | 5005 | 3350 | 5261 | 4425 | 580 | 5915 | 5594 | 5902 | 321 | −308 | 4425 | 1477 |
| 35 | 759 | 59 | 1609 | 700 | −1550 | −37 | 1646 | 70 | 795 | 77 | −725 | 719 | −37 | 114 |
| 36 | 2481 | 0 | 2702 | 2481 | −2702 | 0 | 2702 | 0 | 187 | 0 | −187 | 187 | 0 | 0 |
| 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1229 | 741 | 0 | 488 | 741 | 0 | 0 |
| 38 | 633 | 565 | 680 | 68 | −115 | 680 | 0 | 4663 | 10443 | 680 | −5780 | 9763 | 680 | 0 |
| 39 | 103 | 126 | 132 | −23 | −6 | −656 | 788 | 31031 | 8274 | 2346 | 22757 | 5928 | −656 | 3003 |
| 40 | 61 | 58 | 68 | 3 | −10 | 68 | 0 | 7624 | 11490 | 68 | −3866 | 11422 | 68 | 0 |
| 41 | 1013 | 993 | 1223 | 20 | −230 | 1094 | 129 | 3563 | 4004 | 1126 | −441 | 2877 | 1094 | 32 |
| 42 | 145 | 176 | 177 | −31 | −1 | 177 | 0 | 23741 | 925 | 177 | 22816 | 749 | 177 | 0 |
| Sum | 347775 | 438138 | 206145 | −90363 | 231993 | −76329 | 282474 | 478459 | 305340 | 220461 | 173119 | 84879 | −76329 | 296790 |

*Source:* See Table 4.

TABLE 7. Alternative estimates of supply multipliers in 2007: Province of Hubei

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sector | CB method | CHARM | Scaling error | Technology error | Heterogeneity error | Official data |
| 1 | 1.920 | 1.862 | 0.040 | 0.048 | 0.126 | 1.648 |
| 2 | 1.145 | 1.135 | 0.008 | −0.011 | 0.002 | 1.137 |
| 3 | 1.059 | 1.055 | 0.002 | −0.056 | 0.002 | 1.107 |
| 4 | 1.728 | 1.684 | 0.013 | −0.215 | 0.302 | 1.583 |
| 5 | 2.366 | 2.243 | 0.045 | −0.049 | 0.058 | 2.190 |
| 6 | 2.653 | 2.529 | 0.194 | −0.037 | 0.233 | 2.138 |
| 7 | 3.117 | 2.928 | 0.062 | 0.204 | 0.135 | 2.527 |
| 8 | 3.175 | 2.976 | 0.064 | 0.285 | 0.018 | 2.609 |
| 9 | 2.912 | 2.756 | 0.520 | −0.076 | 0.039 | 2.272 |
| 10 | 2.866 | 2.632 | 0.267 | 0.132 | −0.040 | 2.274 |
| 11 | 1.548 | 1.521 | 0.022 | −0.280 | −0.009 | 1.788 |
| 12 | 2.394 | 2.172 | 0.122 | −0.087 | −0.013 | 2.150 |
| 13 | 2.643 | 2.532 | 0.050 | 0.122 | 0.080 | 2.280 |
| 14 | 2.347 | 2.200 | 0.044 | −0.136 | 0.152 | 2.140 |
| 15 | 2.904 | 2.732 | 0.054 | 0.350 | 0.053 | 2.275 |
| 16 | 2.417 | 2.152 | 0.083 | −0.034 | 0.030 | 2.073 |
| 17 | 3.142 | 2.771 | 0.555 | −0.023 | 0.146 | 2.092 |
| 18 | 2.018 | 1.844 | −0.110 | −0.136 | −0.023 | 2.113 |
| 19 | 2.434 | 1.868 | 0.139 | 0.007 | −0.187 | 1.909 |
| 20 | 2.221 | 1.689 | 0.072 | −0.027 | −0.189 | 1.834 |
| 21 | 2.533 | 2.390 | −0.223 | 0.039 | −0.023 | 2.597 |
| 22 | 1.072 | 1.070 | −0.003 | −0.256 | 0.035 | 1.294 |
| 23 | 2.329 | 2.275 | 0.082 | 0.276 | 0.102 | 1.815 |
| 24 | 2.129 | 2.097 | 0.024 | 0.495 | 0.003 | 1.575 |
| 25 | 2.214 | 2.156 | 0.045 | −0.115 | 0.005 | 2.221 |
| 26 | 2.834 | 2.723 | 0.045 | 0.028 | 0.043 | 2.607 |
| 27 | 2.106 | 2.010 | 0.060 | −0.040 | 0.046 | 1.943 |
| 28 | 2.186 | 2.047 | 0.072 | 0.102 | −0.015 | 1.888 |
| 29 | 1.871 | 1.751 | 0.133 | 0.092 | −0.002 | 1.528 |
| 30 | 1.876 | 1.816 | 0.032 | 0.286 | 0.026 | 1.471 |
| 31 | 2.461 | 2.351 | 0.154 | 0.010 | 0.041 | 2.145 |
| 32 | 1.622 | 1.579 | 0.045 | −0.127 | 0.005 | 1.656 |
| 33 | 1.367 | 1.341 | 0.010 | −0.265 | −0.006 | 1.602 |
| 34 | 2.207 | 1.926 | −0.039 | −0.039 | −0.187 | 2.191 |
| 35 | 2.120 | 2.002 | −0.126 | 0.532 | 0.009 | 1.588 |
| 36 | 1.802 | 1.725 | −0.168 | 0.370 | 0.002 | 1.521 |
| 37 | 2.098 | 2.020 | 0.047 | 0.414 | 0.003 | 1.556 |
| 38 | 2.270 | 2.138 | 0.066 | 0.179 | −0.021 | 1.914 |
| 39 | 2.016 | 1.942 | 0.052 | 0.302 | 0.000 | 1.588 |
| 40 | 2.561 | 2.434 | 0.071 | 0.169 | 0.000 | 2.194 |
| 41 | 2.388 | 2.200 | 0.066 | 0.297 | −0.064 | 1.900 |
| 42 | 2.071 | 1.999 | 0.064 | 0.279 | −0.005 | 1.661 |
| Mean | 2.218 | 2.078 | 0.066 | 0.072 | 0.022 | 1.919 |

*Source:* See Table 4.