Identifying Foreign Suppliers in U.S. Merchandise Import Transactions[1]

by

Fariha Kamal
U.S. Census Bureau

C.J. Krizan
U.S. Census Bureau

Ryan Monarch
Federal Reserve Board

CES 15-11 April, 2015

The research program of the Center for Economic Studies (CES) produces a wide range of economic analyses to improve the statistical programs of the U.S. Census Bureau. Many of these analyses take the form of CES research papers. The papers have not undergone the review accorded Census Bureau publications and no endorsement should be inferred. Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed. Republication in whole or part must be cleared with the authors.

To obtain information about the series, see www.census.gov/ces or contact Fariha Kamal, Editor, Discussion Papers, U.S. Census Bureau, Center for Economic Studies 2K132B, 4600 Silver Hill Road, Washington, DC 20233, CES.Papers.List@census.gov.

Abstract

The availability of international trade transactions data capturing individual relationships between buyers and suppliers permits the answering of numerous new questions governing the economic activity of traders. In this paper, we explore the reliability of two-sided firm trade transactions data sourced from the United States by comparing the number of foreign suppliers from U.S. merchandise import transaction data to origin-country data. We find that the statistic derived from the origin-country data, on average, tends to be 20 percent lower than using the raw U.S. data. Guided by this finding, we propose and implement a set of methods that are capable of aligning the counts more closely from these two different data sources. Overall, our analysis presents broad support for the use of U.S. merchandise import transactions data to study buyer-supplier relationships in international trade.

[1] Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Census Bureau, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or of any other person associated with the Federal Reserve System. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed. Special thanks to Hong Ma, Jeronimo Carballo, and Christian Volpe Martincus for sharing data. We thank Javier Miranda and Nikolas Zolas for valuable comments. We thank Clint Carter and William Wisniewski for timely disclosure review.

1. Introduction

Every international trade transaction is an agreement between two firms, an importer (buyer) and an exporter (supplier), located in two different countries. For this reason, the recent availability of international trade databases that provide the identity of both importers and exporters for individual transactions has fundamental appeal for the field of international trade. Indeed, the existence of such "two-sided" firm trade transactions data has the potential to establish novel facts about traders that can augment the heterogeneous firm framework widely used throughout the literature (Melitz, 2003). To the best of our knowledge, "two-sided" firm trade transactions data has been analyzed for Colombia (Benguria, 2014), Chile and Colombia (Blum, Claro, and Horstmann, 2011), Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Uruguay (Carballo, Ottaviano, and Volpe Martincus, 2013), Norway (Bernard, Moxnes, and Ulltveit-Moe, 2013), and the United States (Bernard, Jensen, and Schott, 2010; Pierce and Schott, 2012; Dragusanu, 2014; Eaton, Eslava, Jinkins, Krizan and Tybout, 2014; Kamal and Sundaram, 2014; Monarch, 2014).

The use of two-sided firm data in international trade research is still in its infancy and it may be fair to characterize the use of such data as cautious. One of the primary reasons is concerns about data quality: in order to have individual transactions that include both importing and exporting entities, one data source must identify individual traders in both countries. It is readily apparent that one country collecting information on exporters originating in another country will be an imperfect undertaking at best. While it is in the best interest of many governments to collect reliable information about firms located in their jurisdiction for taxation purposes, it is not obvious that the same governments would have the incentive, or even the

authority, to maintain accurate statistics on firms located outside its national borders. Subsequently, two-sided trade data will by definition be more susceptible to issues related to the unique and consistent identification of "foreign" suppliers. The purpose of this paper is to examine and assess the reliability of two-sided firm trade data sourced from the United States, specifically U.S. merchandise import transactions collected by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and maintained by the U.S. Census Bureau.[2]

We begin by describing the institutional environment surrounding the construction and collection of the identifier that captures foreign suppliers exporting to the U.S, known as the Manufacturer ID or MID (section 2). The source data is the U.S. merchandise import transactions, which consists of information from every customs form filled out by U.S. firms with import shipments above $2,000. Using this data as well as supporting evidence sourced from CBP and third parties, we investigate the properties of the Manufacturer ID, highlighting both pitfalls and benefits in using the MID to conduct research.

Our goal in this paper is to assess the extent to which the Manufacturer ID represents the foreign supplier. In Section 3, we compare statistics on foreign suppliers generated using the U.S. data to what are, theoretically, the same statistics generated using customs data from selected source country databases, compiled in the World Bank's Exporter Dynamic Database. Trade data from countries exporting to the U.S. originate from official statistical sources, so it is reasonable in our view to attempt to validate the Manufacturer ID via such a comparison. Where possible, we augment these results with more detailed country-specific comparisons. Our main

[2] See http://www.census.gov/ces/dataproducts/datasets/imp.html for further description.

finding is that the raw U.S. data tends to overshoot the number of foreign exporters by about 25 percent. Additionally, certain countries and industries tend to match better. Given this finding, in Section 4, we propose several common-sense algorithms and cleaning methods to modify the MID and generate statistics that align more closely to source-country data.

Overall, our findings are broadly supportive of the usage of the U.S. import data for the purposes of investigating buyer and supplier relationships in international trade. Our analysis supports the usage of the Manufacturer ID as a unique and consistent identifier of foreign-based exporters that transact with U.S. importers, and thus as a window into the two-sided matching dimension of international trade research.

2. Background and History

U.S. importers are required to fill out CBP Form 7501 in order to complete importation of goods into the United States. In addition to information about value, quantity, and 10-digit HTSUS product category of the imported merchandise, firms also have to provide the "Manufacturer ID" (MID) for each product in Box 13 (see Figure 1).[3] Due to strict rules-of-origin requirements, the MID for textile shipments represents the "manufacturer" as defined in Title 19 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), i.e. "the entity performing the origin-conferring operations". [4] Textile products include both textile or apparel products as defined under Section 102.21, Title 19, CFR[5], classified as any products in two-digit HS codes 50 through 63.[6] In

[3] See also form http://forms.cbp.gov/pdf/cbp_form_7501.pdf.
[4] See http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2011-title19-vol1/pdf/CFR-2011-title19-vol1-sec102-23.pdf.
[5] See http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2011-title19-vol1/pdf/CFR-2011-title19-vol1-sec102-21.pdf.

general, for all products, CBP requires that the manufacturer ID constitute the manufacturer and not trading companies, or other trading agents.[7]

Customs Directive No. 3550-055 lays out the current method for deriving an identification code for manufacturers and shippers.[8] The MID consists of an alphanumeric code that is constructed according to a pre-specified algorithm, using information on the seller's name and address from the importer's official invoice. The derivation (known as "keylining") is as follows: the first two characters of the MID must contain the two-digit ISO country code of origin of the good, the next three characters the start of the first word of the exporter's name, the next three characters the start of the second word, the next four characters the first numbers of the street address of the foreign exporter, and the last three characters the first three letters of the foreign exporter's city (see Table 1 for stylized examples).[9] The MID has a maximum length of fifteen characters.

The multi-step process for constructing the MID described above may cause concerns about its reliability as a usable identifier, or the susceptibility of the MID to erroneous data entry by either importing firms or customs brokers. Although CBP Form 7501 may be filled out by individual importers it is common to either employ in-house licensed customs brokers to facilitate the import process or use outside customs brokerage service providers to handle the

---

[6] See http://hts.usitc.gov/ for details on each HS chapter.

[7] https://help.cbp.gov/app/answers/detail/a_id/952/kw/MANUFACTURER%20IDENTIFICATION%20NUMBER/suggested/1.

[8] See http://www.cbp.gov/document/directives/3550-055-instructions-deriving-manufacturershipper-identification-code.

[9] See Block 13 (pg. 7) for description of MID and Appendix 2 (pg. 30) for instructions on constructing MID at http://forms.cbp.gov/pdf/7501_instructions.pdf.

shipment clearance process. Customs regulations, 19 CFR, Part 111, require that a customs broker hold a valid license to transact customs business on behalf of others, and in fact, the Customs Broker License Examinations[10] administered by CBP typically includes a question about MID construction.[11] Moreover, customs brokers utilize specialized software to prepare and transmit invoices electronically to CBP such as SmartBorder.[12] SmartBorder includes validation checks on the entry data. In particular, with respect to the MID, the SmartBorder software can store customer information that can auto-populate, thereby reducing errors due to manual data entry. Overall, 96 percent of all entries filed with CBP are filed electronically through the CBP's Automated Broker Interface (ABI).[13] Together these details allay some concern about the potential for misspellings leading to errors in the construction of the MID. In terms of data coverage alone, the MID is a well-populated variable in the U.S. merchandise import transactions for all years between 1992 and 2008. On average about 10 percent of the MIDs are missing by value while only about 3 percent are missing by count.

What possible incentives would the U.S. government have for making sure that U.S. firms are writing down the identity of their foreign partners correctly? According to U.S. law, there are two apparent reasons. First, the MID is utilized in national security programs such as the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT). An active MID is required to be qualified for the program. Companies that join C-TPAT "sign an agreement to work with CBP to

[10] See http://www.cbp.gov/trade/broker/exam/announcement for details about the exam.
[11] See http://www.cbp.gov/document/publications/past-customs-broker-license-examinations-answer-keys for sample exam questions and answer keys. Questions 5 and 12 on the April 2014 examinations ask about MID construction.
[12] See http://www.smartborder.com/newsb2/ProductsSmartBorderABI.aspx.
[13] http://www.cbp.gov/trade/acs/abi/contact-info

protect the supply chain, identify security gaps, and implement specific security measures and best practices."[14] C-TPAT members are less likely to be subject to examinations at the port since they are considered low-risk. The CBP reports that the program covers about 10,000 companies, accounting for over 50 percent of U.S. import value.

Second, the United States is clearly interested in enforcing trade-related regulatory requirements that relate to the identity of foreign suppliers to the U.S. For instance, anti-dumping measures are foreign-firm specific in nature. Furthermore, it is clear from U.S. regulations that the Manufacturer ID is used to track compliance with U.S. restrictions for textile shipments. MID criteria for textiles are more stringent than those for other products, since non-textile products typically do not have the rule-of-origin restrictions that exist for textile and apparel products. As mentioned earlier, the official "manufacturer" of textile products must be identified through a MID, pursuant to Section 102.21 or 102.22, Title 19, CFR. A single entry filed for textile products of more than one manufacturer require that the products of each manufacturer be separately identified. If an entry filed for such merchandise fails to include the MID properly constructed from the name and address of the manufacturer, the port director may reject the entry or take other appropriate action. The above discussion highlights the regulatory imperatives to provide an accurate MID and thereby establishes our confidence that it provides a consistent basis of identifying the foreign manufacturer in an U.S. merchandise import transaction.

3. Comparison with External Data Sources

[14] http://www.cbp.gov/border-security/ports-entry/cargo-security/c-tpat-customs-trade-partnership-against-terrorism

There may be two main concerns about the construction of the Manufacturer ID: the Manufacturer ID might be either overestimating or underestimating the true number of exporters. Why might using the Manufacturer ID to generate counts of firms exporting to the U.S. result in too many exporters? The most obvious answer rests on two of CBP's requirements in constructing the Manufacturer ID. First, each manufacturer of the same product must be listed separately. Second, trading companies, sellers other than manufacturers, and similar trading agents cannot be used to create MIDs, and this particular requirement is especially strict for textile products. Since countries may count intermediaries as exporters in their customs data, origin-country data compared to the U.S. data may very likely yield lower counts of exporters. Moreover, it is possible that two different U.S. importing firms might be purchasing goods from the same exporting firm, yet constructing the MID differently. For example, one U.S. importer might write down the numerical section of the exporter's address, while another may not. Typographical differences may also arise when entering the letters in the exporter's name or address by the filer of CBP Form 7501. These types of clerical errors would lead to an overestimate of the number of firms exporting to the U.S. Alternatively, it is possible that firms with very similar information are recorded using the same MID, thus leading to an underestimation of the actual number of foreign suppliers.[15]

We assess the potential for clerical errors in the construction of the Manufacturer ID and therefore its use as a unique and consistent identifier of foreign exporters by comparing a number of statistics generated by using the Manufacturer ID to those generated using information from

[15] Obviously, both problems could be occurring simultaneously, thus having an ambiguous effect on the total number of exporters.

external sources. We present results from three exercises. First, we measure both the overall number of foreign exporters in a year and the number of surviving foreign exporters over time in the U.S. import data, and determine how well these numbers match the same moments generated from data compiled by the country of origin. Second, we compare the U.S. merchandise import data to more detailed statistics from existing research and data on trading firms in selected countries. Finally, we report the results of specific comparisons made through using more detailed customs data from China, the largest importing partner of the U.S. (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013).

3.1 Cross-country comparisons using World Bank's Exporter Dynamics Database

We begin by analyzing how statistics calculated using the Manufacturer ID in the U.S. import data compare to the same statistics generated from data collected by reporting agencies in the exporting countries. We first utilize the World Bank's public-use Exporter Dynamics Database (EDD) that contains destination-specific information on exporting firms for 43 countries between 1997 through 2007 (Cebeci, Fernandes, Freund, and Pierola, 2012). For every available year and export destination for these countries, we use the total number of exporting firms and the number of incumbent exporters. The source of the underlying micro data, which is not publicly available, varies from national government statistics (such as in Peru) to figures collected by private companies (such as in Chile) and are thus wholly different sources than the U.S. customs data. We thus compare statistics from the two distinct sources and analyze how closely they align, while being cognizant that the definition of what exactly constitutes a foreign exporter is specific to the U.S., and may not match across different countries.

Column 1 in Table 2 presents a list of countries from the Exporter Dynamics Database, along with the associated average number of exporters over the sample years in Column 2.[16] Column 3 presents the same statistic, average number of exporters, calculated using the Manufacturer ID as it appears in the U.S. import data ("raw"). For most countries in the EDD, the total number of foreign exporters to the U.S. calculated using the raw Manufacturer ID is higher than the corresponding numbers from the World Bank data. Looking at the total number of exporters using EDD (91,841) compared to using the U.S. import data (114,888), we can see that the U.S. data yields counts that are, on average, 25 percent higher. We also run a simple regression of the number of exporters to the U.S. as reported in the Exporter Dynamics Database on the number of MIDs in the U.S. merchandise import transactions data, where each data point is an origin country-year observation present in both datasets. This regression yields a coefficient of 0.84, implying that for every 100 exporters reported in the U.S. import data, the Exporter Dynamic Database reports 84 exporters.

The second comparison between U.S. import data and the Exporter Dynamics Database is a dynamic one. For any given year, it is possible to measure the number of incumbent exporters to the U.S. (exporters that were also found in the previous year). Using U.S. import transactions data, we compute the average number of incumbents from a country, over the time period for which Exporter Dynamic Database data exists, by tracking the number of Manufacturer ID observations that are also found in the previous year. The average number of incumbent exporters using the EDD and the raw MID are presented in Columns 4 and 5 of Table 2. As with

[16] The years in the database range from 1997 to 2007, though the actual number of years with available exporter data varies by country. See Cebeci et al (2012) for full details.

the findings for the average number of exporters reported in Columns 2 and 3, we tend to find a higher number of incumbents using the U.S. import data than reported in the EDD. An exception is Mexico, for which U.S. data implies a lower number of incumbents compared to that reported in EDD.

3.2 *Cross-country comparisons from various sources*

We next turn to comparisons of number of exporters calculated using the MID from the U.S. import data with same statistics derived from both published and unpublished academic work. We identified three papers using firm-level data from individual countries that report figures for the number of exporters to the U.S.: Bekes, Harasztosi, and Murakozy (2009) for Hungary, Eaton et al. (2014) for Colombia, and Bernard et al. (2014) for Norway. We also report figures for Uruguay, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and China. The results are presented in Table 3.

Bekes et al. (2009, 2011) utilize Hungarian firm-trade linked data, based on firm balance sheet information combined with customs data.[17] Row 1 in Table 3 compares the figures for 2003 with the same figures calculated using the MID in the U.S. import data. The number of Hungarian firms exporting to the U.S. calculated using U.S. import data far exceeds the number reported using Hungarian data.[18]

Eaton et al. (2014) provide the number of exporters from Colombia to the U.S. for 2000 through 2008. We compare the number of Colombian firms exporting to the U.S. in 2008 as

[17] Table 27 in Bekes et. al (2009) presents the number of exporting firms by country of destination.

[18] The data from Bekes et, al (2009, 2011) is from the Hungarian Statistical Office from Customs declarations. It excludes trade of goods "stored unaltered in bonded warehouse and duty free zones". The authors note that "26 percent of export observations (firm-year) are not merged with production data, resulting in about 5,000 dropped observations per year". These observations are also not included in their tables, a total of about 3-5 percent of total trade.

shown in row 2 of Table 3. Again, we see that U.S. data yields a higher number of exporters than using origin-country data. The authors also document this finding in Appendix A of their paper, and note that difference in value is only about 10 percent. In order to examine the reasons for larger differences in firm counts, the authors compare the number of firms across the two data sources by HS2 categories to find that counts using the Manufacturer ID are higher in only 28 of the 82 codes and the biggest differences arise in HS codes 61 and 62: textiles. They show that removal of these two sectors from the list reverses the firm counts such that the Colombian data yield higher number of exporters. This finding is in line with regulations pertaining to reporting requirement for Manufacturer IDs in textile products under Title 19, CFR. The MID must represent the manufacturer for textile products and furthermore products of each manufacturer must be separately identified.

Bernard, Moxnes, and Ultveit-Moe (2014) utilize transactions level data on Norwegian exporters, and similar to U.S. import data, are able to positively identify both buyers and sellers. Table 1 in their paper presents a number of statistics, including the number of Norwegian exporters to the U.S. as well as the number of U.S. buyers that transact with Norwegian exporters. We compare the number of Norwegian exporters to the U.S. using the MID to theirs in Table 3, row 3 for the year 2006. In the Norwegian case, the U.S. data comes much closer to matching the total number of exporters implied by Norwegian data.

Additionally, using information from the Norwegian export transactions data, the authors calculate that 5,992 U.S. buyers transact with Norwegian exporters in 2006. Using the 2006

LFTTD-IMP[19] we calculate that there are 1,485 U.S. importers that imported merchandise goods from Norway. The number of U.S. importers that transact with Norwegian exporters is four times higher using Norwegian export transactions data compared to U.S. merchandise import transactions data. This emphasizes further the difficulties in managing two-sided data and underscores the point that the collection of information by one country on firms in another country is an imperfect undertaking. Nonetheless, these newly available two-sided trade data offer a valuable resource to understand various aspects of individual buyer-seller relationships across national borders.

The next three rows in Table 3 provide statistics for Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Ecuador, respectively. The number of exporters lines up well using the two different data sources for Uruguay; while Costa Rica and Ecuador have much higher estimates using the MID variable in the U.S. merchandise import transactions as compared to data from their national data sources.

3.3. Comparisons with Chinese trade statistics

Our final exercise analyzes the number of Chinese exporters to the U.S., derived both from Chinese export data and U.S. import data in 2006. Table 3, row 7, shows the number of exporters computed using Chinese customs data as well as those computed using the MID. The number of Chinese exporters to the U.S. in 2006 using Chinese customs data represents only 40 percent of the number calculated using U.S. merchandise import data. The potential for higher counts of foreign exporters using the MID may be due to the requirement that U.S. importers go "directly to the source" when constructing the Manufacturer ID, a trend which should be

[19] LFTTD-IMP refers to the Linked Foreign Trade Transactions Database that links individual import transactions to a firm identifier for the U.S. importer. See Bernard, Jensen, and Schott (2009) for data description.

especially pronounced in textiles due to stringent requirements to report the actual sourcing entity for every HS10 product.

For the case of U.S.-China trade, it is actually possible to delve deeper into which products produce the widest discrepancy, as we have access to the number of Chinese exporters to the U.S. by HS2 category. This is especially valuable given the well-known differences in MID reporting requirements for textile and non-textile shipments discussed in Section 2. We would expect some evidence that the more detailed reporting requirements associated with textile products to be consistent with higher numbers of exporters than country-specific data might provide, as well as providing a valuable signal to researchers about the scope of overestimation by industry. Indeed, Chinese exporter counts at the HS2 level display significant variation across different product categories.

In Table 4, we present the HS2 codes where the total counts of Chinese exporters vary most widely between Chinese and U.S. data. For example, the count of exporters generated using Chinese customs data trading "Silk, Yarn, and Woven Fabric" is about half that of the count generated using the U.S. import transactions data. Textiles (HS2 61-63) and other fabric textiles (HS2 50-52) display some of the highest differences, but a few other categories also appear to be differing significantly. If we exclude the top 10 industries where the U.S. data appears to overestimate the number of Chinese exporters (representing 83 percent of total U.S. import value from China), then the China/U.S. count ratio rises from 40 percent to 54 percent. If we further drop all HS2 industries where the total number of exporters from U.S. data is more than double

the number from Chinese data (representing 76 percent of total U.S. import value from China), the China/U.S. count share increases further to 59 percent.[20]

A final check that we undertake is to construct Manufacturer IDs from firm names and addresses from Chinese firm level survey data, following closely the algorithms set forth by CBP and described in Section 2. We can then evaluate the uniqueness and consistency of the constructed MIDs vis-à-vis the source country data. There are two advantages to this approach. First, this exercise allows us to quantify how commonplace the problem of two firms having the same Manufacturer ID is. Second, we can assess how often the same firm has a changing Manufacturer ID over time. Monarch (2014) undertakes this exercise with Chinese firm-level data collected by the Chinese National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). He creates a pseudo-MID for a set of exporting firms within particular Chinese Industrial Classification Codes (CIC) using the firm name, city and address, with Chinese characters romanized according to the *Hanyu Pinyin* system, and provides evidence of how uniquely MIDs are identified in the cross-section and over time. Table 5 reproduces the tables in Monarch (2014).

For five selected industries in 2005, panels A, B, and C show results from three exercises. Panel A, column 2 shows the number of Chinese exporters within each industry calculated using NBS firm level data. Column 3 shows the number of pseudo-MIDs that could be created using the name and address information in the same dataset. The final column lists the percentage share of pseudo-MIDs in the total number of exporters. The very high percentages (ranging from

[20] About 20 percent of HS2 products are associated with a fewer number of exporters using the U.S. data than the Chinese data. However, the number of exporters calculated using Chinese data is more than double the number from U.S. data in only one HS2 product category.

97 to 100 percent) indicate that the algorithm used to generate MIDs is capable of producing unique identifiers for an exporter. Panel B shows results from an identical exercise using city information. Column 2 shows the number of cities with at least one exporter within each industry using NBS firm level data. Column 3 shows the unique number of cities generated using the last three digits of the pseudo-MIDs. Again, the higher percentages in the final column indicate that the three digit codes in the MID representing the city of the exporter tends to match the actual number of cities quite well. Panel C illustrates the rarity of the same exporting firm will have changes in name, address, or location that would result in a different pseudo-MID. Taken together, the results in this table are another demonstration that U.S. importers constructing MIDs according to the rules described in Section 2 are likely to generate reasonably unique and consistent identifiers of foreign exporting firms.

4. Methods for Improving the Count of Foreign Exporters

We have described earlier the potential for higher counts in the U.S. data, and have demonstrated that indeed, when comparing U.S. data to foreign data, the number of foreign exporters generated using U.S. data tends to be larger than using origin-country data. This is not altogether surprising. In fact, it is not unusual to find differences in the counts of businesses across different data sources, even when they measure the same domestic economy. For example, Becker, Elvery, Foster, Krizan, Nguyen, and Talan (2005) compare the number of establishments in the U.S. reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) to published totals from the Census Bureau. They find that the BLS count of establishments is about 9 percent

higher than counts generated using Census data. In a follow-up study, Elvery, Foster, Krizan, and Talan (2006) matched the businesses in the two files and found that the 6-digit NAICS codes assigned by the agencies differed for about 17-33 percent of the establishments.

Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to consider how potential clerical issues with the MID may be addressed. Guided by our findings in Section 3, we present two alternative methods to address the incidence of over-counting foreign exporters using the U.S. data - (1) "brute force" removal of different components of the Manufacturer ID and treating the truncated ID as the unique identifier of an exporter, and (2) implementing a matching protocol to determine how many "similar" Manufacturer IDs are present in the data. The first approach is more straightforward, but carries the risk of eliminating a significant amount of information. It is possible that different exporters may in fact have very similar Manufacturer IDs, thus making it especially likely that exporters will have identical truncated MIDs. The second approach is more nuanced, but requires quantifying the notion of "similar", as well as some significant computational capacity. In order for researchers to better understand the tradeoff, we describe the results of each method in detail.

4.1 MID Truncation

We first provide analysis based on removing certain segments of the Manufacturer ID. As detailed above, U.S. importers are required to write the first four numbers of their export partner's address and the first three letters of the exporter's city in order to construct the MID. Numbers may be likely sources of input errors since they may be transposed more easily than alpha characters. City names may be prone to errors due to different interpretations about the specific geographic location of a supplier. For instance, Kamal and Sundaram (2014) study the

role of Bangladeshi textile exporters located in the same city and exporting to a particular U.S. importer in facilitating a match with the same U.S. importer. They find that in their sample of Bangladeshi textile exporters to the U.S., the city variable extracted from the MID may represent both districts and sub-districts in Bangladesh.

In order to mitigate the potential overestimation of exporter counts using the MID, it is possible to eliminate numbers or last three characters from the raw MID, and then treat identical truncated MIDs as a single exporter. Thus, the final effect of removing one or the other component is to reduce the number of foreign suppliers generated using the U.S. data. For this reason, we utilize the different permutations of the Manufacturer ID excluding all numeric characters ("no number") and excluding the last three characters ("no city") and recalculate the average number of exporters in columns 4 and 5 of Table 6.

Applying the simple cleaning procedures - either eliminating street numbers or eliminating the city - tends to produce total foreign exporter estimates that are much closer to the totals reported in the Exporter Dynamic Database, with few notable exceptions. If we replicate the regression from Section 3.1, the regression coefficients for the "no number" and "no city" versions of the MID are 1.001 and 0.94, respectively, suggesting that these truncation methods are capable of reducing the number of MIDs to generate the number of foreign exporters that are more in line with those reported by the origin country. Table 7, depicting the number of exporters to the U.S. for seven countries, shows that there are significant improvements in matching the sources originally described in Table 3 as well. These cleaning procedures also improves the match between U.S. and Chinese datasets for the number of Chinese exporters: the

China/U.S. count share rises to 52.93 percent (no city), and 58.74 percent (no number), from 40 percent when using the raw MID.

4.2 Bigram Matching Algorithm

An alternative to applying a "brute force" cleaning procedure is to use a bigram matching algorithm, and set a standard for determining if any Manufacturer ID is "similar enough" to another Manufacturer ID. Bigram is an approximate string comparator computed from the ratio of the number of common two consecutive letters of the two strings and their average length minus one (Wasi and Flaaen, 2014). In this way, one could be more conservative about which sets of Manufacturer IDs may be more likely to represent the same firm by setting the threshold for matching to be as high as desired. We implement such a procedure by tallying the number of matching string-variable component bigrams, and combining them into a field-similarity score following. [21] Appendix I provides examples of pairs and their associated field-similarity score. Within each country exporting to the U.S. in a given year, we compare each Manufacturer ID to every other Manufacturer ID, and for those matches (or sets of matches) with high field-similarity scores, we collapse them down into a single Manufacturer ID.

While this method sometimes works the same way as the blunter excise approach, it may (depending on the threshold) capture subtler differences in the Manufacturing ID, or allow similar MIDs with very different addresses to still be counted as different firms. For the 15 character Manufacturer ID, we identify a few rules of thumb for field-similarity: a score of 0.98 or higher tends to match MIDs with 1-2 characters being different, while scores of 0.97 or higher

[21] We utilize the reclink2 module in STATA (Wasi and Flaaen, 2014).

tend to match to those MIDs that are identical in all aspects except for the address field. We use both 0.98 and 0.97 as standards for whether two MIDs are similar enough, and report the total number of foreign exporters according to each one. We believe these standards are sufficiently low, so as to allow for the possibility of simple coding errors, while still being stringent enough to not lump together two different firms. Table 8 presents the number of foreign suppliers by country of origin that are dropped with a 0.97 and a 0.98 field-similarity score in 2008. We see that eliminating "very similar" Manufacturer IDs using the matching procedure reduces the number of foreign suppliers by about 10-15 percentage points compared to counts generated using the "raw" Manufacturer ID. Furthermore, the bigram matching algorithm described here also goes some way towards improving the match, with China/U.S. data count shares reaching 57.93 percent (for a 0.98 similarity score) and 63.39 percent (for a 0.97 similarity score) compared to 40 percent using the "raw" MID.

Finally, as a supplement to our "cleaning" procedure, we manually inspect 100 random Norwegian Manufacturer IDs. The goal is to identify instances where multiple Manufacturer IDs may actually refer to the same firm, using reasonable judgment. We find 23 Manufacturer IDs that we flag as potentially "problematic" - we find a total of 23 codes that are similar enough to another code, such that instead of these 23 foreign firms there should be 11. Thus, through our manual scanning exercise to identify "problematic" MIDs we reduce the number of MIDs by 12 percent, within the range generated through the matching program. In fact, if we apply the matching algorithm to this sample, 17 MIDs would be identified as problematic, and would

collapse into eight firms, reducing the number of MIDs by 9 percent, closely mirroring our subjective assessment.

As described at length throughout this paper, the likelihood that figures from different sources will match is rare as evidenced even in aggregate data on trade volume between the U.S. and Hungary or the U.S. and China that have well-known discrepancies based on which country's data is used.[22] However, we view the above exercises as demonstrating that the Manufacturer ID variable, especially incorporating our cleaning procedures or paying attention to particular sectors, tends to match outside data closely providing reasonable assurance in using it as a consistent identifier of foreign suppliers to study exporter-importer relationships in international trade.

5. Summary

This paper investigates the properties and potential research uses of the "Manufacturer ID" variable that identifies the foreign supplier in a U.S. merchandise import transaction. We document the rules and laws that govern the generation of the MID, noting that the MID is primarily meant to capture the origin-conferring entity in a merchandise import transaction. We compute the number of exporters to the U.S. for a set of countries using the "Manufacturer ID" and compare these to the same statistic computed using data sourced from the origin-country. Our findings suggest that, on average, using the MID to compute these statistics tend to exceed those using data from foreign data sources. Guided by this finding, we explore two main ways to

[22] See https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/reconcile/china.html; https://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/aip/recon_china_000406.pdf

“clean” the MID. Recreating the statistics using the modified MIDs, using either method, align more closely with statistics from origin-country data sources.

We believe that the Manufacturer ID is a key element in allowing deeper investigations of buyer and supplier relationships in international trade. Our findings offer the first set of systematic evidence in identifying potential issues with using the MID, countries and sectors where these issues may be more pronounced, and finally algorithms to modify the MID in order to address the pertinent concerns. Future work linking individual firm-trade linked data from origin countries to the U.S. merchandise import data will prove invaluable in furthering our understating of the MID variable and subsequently its uses.

References

Becker, Randy, Joel Elvery, Lucia Foster, C.J. Krizan, Sang Nguyen, and David Talan, 2005. "A Comparison of the Business Registers Used By the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of the Census," Paper presented at 2005 Joint Statistical Meetings.

Bekes, Gabor, Balazs Murakozy, and Peter Harasztosi, 2009. "Firms and Products in International Trade: Evidence from Hungary," MT-DP-2009/19.

Bekes, Gabor, Balazs Murakozy, and Peter Harasztosi, 2011. "Firms and Products in International Trade: Evidence from Hungary," *Economic Systems* 35(1), 4-24.

Benguria, Felipe, 2014. "Production and Distribution in International Trade: Evidence from Matched Exporter-Importer Data," mimeo.

Bernard, Andrew B., J. Bradford Jensen, and Peter K. Schott, 2010. "Wholesalers and Retailers in U.S. Trade," *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 408-413.

Bernard, Andrew B., J. Bradford Jensen, and Peter K. Schott, 2009. "Importers, Exporters and Multinationals: A Portrait of Firms in the U.S. that Trade Goods," In *Producer Dynamics : New Evidence from Micro Data*, eds. Timothy Dunne, J. Bradford Jensen, and Mark J. Roberts, 513-552. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bernard, Andrew B., J. Bradford Jensen, Stephen J. Redding, and Peter K. Schott, 2007. "Firms in International Trade," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21(3), 105-130.

Bernard, Andrew B., Andreas Moxnes, and Karen Helene Ulltveit-Moe, 2013. "Two-sided Heterogeneity and Trade', mimeo.

Blum, Bernardo, Sebastian Claro, and Ignatius Horstmann, 2011. "Intermediation and the Nature of Trade Costs: Theory and Evidence," mimeo.

Carballo, Jeronimo, Christian Volpe Martincus, and Gianmarco Ottaviano, 2013. "The Buyer Margins of Exports," Center for Economic Performance working paper 9584.

Cebeci, Tolga, Ana Fernandes, Caroline Freund, and Martha Pierola, 2012. "Exporter Dynamics Database," World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 6229.

di Giovanni, Julian and Andrei Levchenko, 2013. "Firm Entry, Trade and Welfare in Zipf's World," *Journal of International Economics*, 89(2), 283-296.

Dragusanu, Raluca, 2014. "Firm-to-Firm Matching Along the Global Supply Chain," Harvard University working paper.

Eaton, Jonathan, Marcel Eslava, David Jinkins, C.J. Krizan, and James Tybout, 2013. "A Search and Learning Model of Export Dynamics," Pennsylvania State University working paper.

Elvery, Joel, Lucia Foster, C.J. Krizan, and David Talan, 2006. "Preliminary Micro Data Results from the Business List Comparison Project," Paper presented at 2006 Joint Statistical Meetings.

Kamal, Fariha, and Asha Sundaram, 2014. "Buyer-Seller Relationships in International Trade: Do Your Neighbors Matter?" US Census Bureau Center for Economic Studies working paper 14-44.

Melitz, Marc J., 2003. "The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity," *Econometrica* 71(6), 1695-1725.

Monarch, Ryan, 2014. "It's Not You, It's Me: Breakups in US-China Trade Relationships," US Census Bureau Center for Economic Studies working paper 14-08.

Pierce, Justin R. and Peter K. Schott, 2012. "The Surprisingly Swift Decline of U.S. Manufacturing Employment," NBER working paper 18655.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2013. "U.S. International Trade in Goods and Services, April 2013," http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/Press-Release/2013pr/12/ft900.pdf. Accessed 18, September, 2014.

Wasi, Nada, and Aaron Flaeen, 2014. "Record Linkage Using STATA: Pre-processing, Linking, and Reviewing Utilities," University of Michigan working paper.

Figure 1. Excerpt from CBP Form 7501

Form Approved OMB No. 1651-0022
EXP. 10-31-2017

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

ENTRY SUMMARY

1. Filer Code/Entry No.	2. Entry Type		3. Summary Date
4. Surety No.	5. Bond Type	6. Port Code	7. Entry Date
8. Importing Carrier	9. Mode of Transport	10. Country of Origin	11. Import Date
12. B/L or AWB No.	13. Manufacturer ID	14. Exporting Country	15. Export Date
16. I.T. No.	17. I.T. Date	18. Missing Docs	19. Foreign Port of Lading
20. U.S. Port of Unlading			
21. Location of Goods/G.O. No.	22. Consignee No.	23. Importer No.	24. Reference No.

25. Ultimate Consignee Name and Address

City State Zip

26. Importer of Record Name and Address

City State Zip

27. Line No.	28. Description of Merchandise	29. A. HTSUS No. B. ADA/CVD No.	30. A. Grossweight B. Manifest Qty.	31. Net Quantity in HTSUS Units	32. A. Entered Value B. CHGS C. Relationship	33. A. HTSUS Rate B. ADA/CVD Rate C. IRC Rate D. Visa No.	34. Duty and I.R. Tax Dollars	Cents

Other Fee Summary for Block 39

35. Total Entered Value

$

Total Other Fees

$

CBP USE ONLY		TOTALS
A. LIQ CODE	B. Ascertained Duty	37. Duty
REASON CODE	C. Ascertained Tax	38. Tax
	D. Ascertained Other	39. Other
	E. Ascertained Total	40. Total

36. DECLARATION OF IMPORTER OF RECORD (OWNER OR PURCHASER) OR AUTHORIZED AGENT

I declare that I am the ☐ importer of record and that the actual owner, purchaser, or consignee for CBP purposes is as shown above, OR ☐ owner or purchaser or agent thereof. I further declare that the merchandise ☐ was obtained pursuant to a purchase or agreement to purchase and that the prices set forth in the invoices are true, OR ☐ was not obtained pursuant to a purchase or agreement to purchase and the statements in the invoices as to value or price are true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I also declare that the statements in the documents herein filed fully disclose to the best of my knowledge and belief the true prices, values, quantities, rebates, drawbacks, fees, commissions, and royalties and are true and correct, and that all goods or services provided to the seller of the merchandise either free or at reduced cost are fully disclosed.
I will immediately furnish to the appropriate CBP officer any information showing a different statement of facts.

41. DECLARANT NAME TITLE SIGNATURE DATE

42. Broker/Filer Information (Name, address, phone number)

43. Broker/Importer File No.

Paperwork Reduction Act Notice CBP Form 7501 (06/09)

Table 1. Stylized Examples of Manufacturer ID.

Country	Exporter Name	Address	City	MANUFID
Bangladesh	Red Fabrics	1234 Curry Road	Dhaka	BDREDFAB1234DHA
France	Green Chemicals	1111 Baguette Lane	Paris	FRGRECHE1111PAR
Republic of Korea	Blue Umbrellas	88 Kimchi Street	Seoul	KRBLUUMB88SEO

Notes: The above examples are based on fictitious names and addresses and are meant for illustrative purposes only.

Table 2. Average Number of Foreign Suppliers, Selected Countries.

Country	Average Number of Foreign Suppliers Using:		Average Number of Incumbent Foreign Suppliers Using:	
	World Bank EDD	Raw MID	World Bank EDD	Raw MID
Albania	40	43	16	14
Belgium	5,223	8,136	3,417	4,224
Bangladesh	1,881	3,041	1,295	1,595
Bulgaria	1,015	771	559	346
Botswana	43	31	18	11
Chile	2,047	3,123	1,335	1,647
Cameroon	95	83	49	25
Colombia	3,608	4,823	2,345	2,579
Costa Rica	1,027	1,583	705	812
Dominican Republic	1,466	1,807	801	917
Ecuador	1,122	2,043	653	1,072
Egypt	821	1,495	505	730
Spain	13,874	15,747	8,388	8,286
Estonia	308	205	159	91
Guatemala	1,376	2,094	900	1,075
Iran	907	469	264	142
Jordan	201	464	111	215
Kenya	412	422	222	195
Cambodia	260	628	190	355
Laos	22	54	8	20
Lebanon	337	388	-	-
Morocco	490	669	272	301
Mexico	26,762	31,662	17,002	15,728
Macedonia	73	125	35	61

Mali	17	25	-	-
Mauritius	150	232	94	130
Malawi	54	54	21	28
Nicaragua	406	624	244	323
Norway	2,003	2,467	1,183	1,158
Pakistan	4,042	4,692	2,685	2,712
Peru	2,069	2,477	1,213	1,248
Portugal	2,607	3,814	1,697	1,952
Senegal	35	39	-	-
El Salvador	876	978	498	488
Sweden	7,606	7,762	5,038	4,031
Turkey	4,368	7,982	2,686	3,806
Tanzania	196	140	104	58
Uganda	64	64	28	28
Yemen	15	25	-	-
South Africa	4,007	3,700	2,396	1,567
Total	91,841	114,888	57,123	58,122

Notes: This table reports the average number of all and incumbent foreign suppliers calculated using the Manufacturer ID over the years 1992 through 2008. "Raw" refers to MIDs as they appear in the import data.

Table 3. Cross-country comparisons in number of exporters, Selected Countries and Years.

			U.S. Merchandise Import Data
Country/Year	**Source**	**Source Data**	**Raw MID**
Hungary (2003)	Bekes et al. (2011)	714	1,238
Colombia (2008)	Eaton et. al. (2014)	2,161	4,518
Norway (2006)	Bernard et al. (2014)	2,088	2,584
Uruguay (2008)	DNA	597	559
Costa Rica (2008)	PROCOMER	1,116	1,627
Ecuador (2008)	SENAE	1,151	1,973
China (2006)	China Customs	76,081	190,376

Notes: This table compares the number of exporters from selected countries selling to the U.S. from two distinct data sources – official customs data by country and the U.S. Merchandise Import Transactions data. The statistics for China have been provided by Hong Ma and for Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Ecuador have been provided by Jeronimo Carballo and Christian Volpe Martincus. "Raw" refers to MIDs as they appear in the U.S. import data.

Table 4. Number of Chinese Suppliers, by HS2.

HS2 Category	HS2 Description	Chinese #/ US #/
98	Special Classification Provisions	0.04
80	Tin and Articles Thereof	0.15
93	Arms and Ammunition	0.28
13	Lac, Gums, Resin, Etc.	0.31
26	Ores, Slag and Ash	0.47
50	Silk, Yarn, and Woven Fabric	0.49
62	Articles of Apparel and Clothing, Not Knitted	0.56
95	Toys, Games, and Sports Equipment	0.64
61	Articles of Apparel and Clothing, Knitted	0.74
3	Fish and Crustaceans	0.75
63	Made-up Textiles Articles	0.76
64	Footwear, Gaiters, and the Like	0.81
20	Preps of Vegetables, Fruits, Nuts, Etc.	0.86
53	Other Veg. Textile Fibers	0.89
52	Cotton Yarns and Woven Fabrics Thereof	0.96

Notes: See http://www.usitc.gov/tata/hts/bychapter/ for details on each chapter of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States. The third column reports the share of the count of Chinese exporters derived from Chinese customs data in the count of Chinese exporters derived from U.S. merchandise import transactions data.

Table 5. Analysis of Pseudo-MIDs as Constructed from China Industrial Production Data, Selected Industries

Panel A: Uniqueness of Pseudo-MID, 2005

Industry CIC	# Exporters	# Psuedo-MIDs	%
CIC 3663	39	38	97
CIC 3689	27	26	97
CIC 3353	37	37	100
CIC 3331	35	35	100
CIC 4154	74	73	99

Notes: Panel A uses name, address, and city information from China NBS firm data to construct a Pseudo-MID for each firm, according to the rules laid out in U.S. CBP Form 7501. In constructing the name of the firm in English, we use the Hanyu Pinyin romanization of Chinese characters, with two to three characters per word of the English name. The second column states the number of firms with positive export values in the given industry in 2005. The third column states the number of unique constructed Pseudo-MIDs.

Panel B: Uniqueness of City Codes, 2005

Industry CIC	# Cities	# City Codes	%
CIC 3663	22	21	96
CIC 3689	15	14	93
CIC 3353	28	24	86
CIC 3331	15	13	87
CIC 4154	19	18	95

Notes: Panel B uses city information from China NBS firm data to construct city information as found in the MID, where only the first three letters of city are given. The second column states the true number of cities with at least one exporting firm in the data from 2005, while the third column states the number of unique city codes.

Panel C: Changes in Pseudo-MID over Time, 2005-2006

Industry CIC	# Exporters	# Psuedo-MIDs	%
CIC 3663	33	33	100
CIC 3689	26	26	100
CIC 3353	31	28	90
CIC 3331	20	17	85
CIC 4154	63	62	98

Notes: Panel C uses name, address, and city information from China NBS firm data to track whether constructed Pseudo-MIDs change over time for the same firm, identified here using the *faren daima* firm identifier from the NBS data. The second column states the number of exporting firms found in both 2005 and 2006, while the third column states the number of firms that have identical Pseudo-MIDs in both 2005 and 2006.

Source: China National Bureau of Statistics, Monarch (2014).

Table 6. Panel A. Average Number of Foreign Suppliers, Selected Countries.

Country	Average Number of Foreign Suppliers Using:			
	World Bank EDD	Raw MID	MID – No Numbers	MID – No City
Albania	40	43	42	41
Belgium	5,223	8,136	6,930	7,632
Bangladesh	1,881	3,041	2,321	2,726
Bulgaria	1,015	771	697	741
Botswana	43	31	26	29
Chile	2,047	3,123	2,372	2,791
Cameroon	95	83	78	82
Colombia	3,608	4,823	3,530	4,510
Costa Rica	1,027	1,583	1,237	1,379
Dominican Republic	1,466	1,807	1,404	1,639
Ecuador	1,122	2,043	1,507	1,879
Egypt	821	1,495	1,259	1,256
Spain	13,874	15,747	12,667	13,574
Estonia	308	205	191	199
Guatemala	1,376	2,094	1,629	1,739
Iran	907	469	431	463
Jordan	201	464	354	385
Kenya	412	422	362	397
Cambodia	260	628	530	459
Laos	22	54	48	52
Lebanon	337	388	364	366
Morocco	490	669	594	625
Mexico	26,762	31,662	26,626	27,784
Macedonia	73	125	116	119
Mali	17	25	24	24
Mauritius	150	232	218	188
Malawi	54	54	49	52
Nicaragua	406	624	465	574
Norway	2,003	2,467	1,997	2,312
Pakistan	4,042	4,692	3,486	4,410
Peru	2,069	2,477	2,001	2,216
Portugal	2,607	3,814	3,159	3,355

Senegal	35	39	37	38
El Salvador	876	978	786	813
Sweden	7,606	7,762	6,177	7,233
Turkey	4,368	7,982	5,963	7,157
Tanzania	196	140	127	138
Uganda	64	64	55	62
Yemen	15	25	24	24
South Africa	4,007	3,700	3,298	3,390
Total	91,841	114,888	93,098	102,763

Table 6. Panel B. Average Number of Incumbent Foreign Suppliers, For Selected Countries.

Country	Average Number of Incumbent Foreign Suppliers Using:			
	World Bank EDD	Raw MID	MID – No Numbers	MID – No City
Albania	16	14	14	13
Belgium	3,417	4,224	4,222	4,106
Bangladesh	1,295	1,595	1,588	1,518
Bulgaria	559	346	346	340
Botswana	18	11	11	11
Chile	1,335	1,647	1,644	1,525
Cameroon	49	25	25	25
Colombia	2,345	2,579	2,577	2,470
Costa Rica	705	812	812	746
Dominican Republic	801	917	915	860
Ecuador	653	1,072	1,068	1,023
Egypt	505	730	731	646
Spain	8,388	8,286	8,275	7,477
Estonia	159	91	91	91
Guatemala	900	1,075	1,074	940
Iran	264	142	142	143
Jordan	111	215	215	180
Kenya	222	195	195	190
Cambodia	190	355	355	279
Laos	8	20	20	19
Morocco	272	301	301	290
Mexico	17,002	15,728	15,714	14,758
Macedonia	35	61	61	59
Mauritius	94	130	130	109
Malawi	21	28	28	28
Nicaragua	244	323	322	308
Norway	1,183	1,158	1,158	1,137
Pakistan	2,682	2,712	2,707	2,627
Peru	1,213	1,248	1,248	1,163
Portugal	1,697	1,952	1,949	1,820
El Salvador	498	488	488	435
Sweden	5,038	4,031	4,029	3,928

Turkey	2,686	3,806	3,799	3,575
Tanzania	104	58	58	58
Uganda	28	28	28	28
South Africa	2,396	1,567	1,567	1,521
Total	57,123	58,122	58,061	54,598

Notes: Panels A (B) in this table reports the average number of all (incumbent foreign suppliers calculated using three versions of the Manufacturer ID over the years 1992 through 2008. "Raw" refers to MIDs as they appear in the import data; "No Numbers" excludes numeric characteristics in the Raw MID and "No City" excludes the last three characters in the Raw MID.

Table 7. Cross-country comparisons in number of exporters, Selected Countries and Years.

			U.S. Merchandise Import Data		
Country/Year	**Source**	**Source Data**	**Raw MID**	**MID - No Number**	**MID - No City**
Hungary (2003)	Bekes et al. (2009)	714	1,238	1,073	1,170
Colombia (2008)	Eaton et. al. (2014)	2,161	4,518	3,290	4,286
Norway (2006)	Bernard et al. (2014)	2,088	2,584	2,078	2,402
Uruguay (2008)	DNA	597	559	456	547
Costa Rica (2008)	PROCOMER	1,116	1,627	1,287	1,408
Ecuador (2008)	SENAE	1,151	1,973	1,438	1,805
China (2006)	China Customs	76,081	190,376	129,517	143,752

Notes: This table compares the number of exporters from selected countries selling to the U.S. from two distinct data sources – official customs data and the U.S. Merchandise Import Transactions data. The statistics for China have been provided by Hong Ma and for Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Ecuador have been provided by Jeronimo Carballo and Christian Volpe Martincus. "Raw" refers to MIDs as they appear in the import data; "No Numbers" excludes numeric characteristics in the Raw MID and "No City" excludes the last three characters in the Raw MID.

Table 8. Number of Foreign Suppliers, by Country, 2008.

Country	Raw MID	Not "Similar" at: 0.98 Match Score	%	Not "Similar" at: 0.97 Match Score	%
Aruba	98	90	0.92	85	0.87
Afghanistan	238	220	0.92	209	0.88
Angola	77	73	0.95	69	0.90
Albania	61	58	0.95	57	0.93
U.A.E.	1,631	1,510	0.93	1,427	0.87
Argentina	4,168	3,737	0.90	3,485	0.84
Armenia	80	74	0.93	72	0.90
Antigua & Barbuda	55	55	1.00	53	0.96
Australia	10,548	9,724	0.92	9,103	0.86
Austria	4,502	4,009	0.89	3,788	0.84
Belgium	6,972	6,348	0.91	6,006	0.86
Bangladesh	3,403	2,876	0.85	2,574	0.76
Bulgaria	778	735	0.94	699	0.90
Bahrain	178	158	0.89	156	0.88
Bahamas	387	377	0.97	354	0.91
Bosnia & Herzegovina	97	91	0.94	89	0.92
Belarus	136	133	0.98	129	0.95
Bolivia	468	424	0.91	398	0.85
Brazil	12,058	10,346	0.86	9,107	0.76
Barbados	150	142	0.95	140	0.93
Botswana	49	46	0.94	45	0.92
Canada	76,654	69,150	0.90	66,005	0.86
Chile	2,968	2,579	0.87	2,344	0.79
China	304,509	216,278	0.71	189,028	0.62
Côte d'Ivoire	180	170	0.94	158	0.88
Cameroon	141	136	0.96	130	0.92
Congo	64	61	0.95	58	0.91
Colombia	4,452	3,934	0.88	3,615	0.81
Costa Rica	1,634	1,450	0.89	1,307	0.80
Cyprus	101	97	0.96	93	0.92
Czech Republic	2,949	2,647	0.90	2,524	0.86
Germany	57,078	49,065	0.86	45,946	0.80

Dominica	14	13	0.93	12	0.86
Denmark	4,796	4,281	0.89	4,087	0.85
Dominican Republic	1,529	1,323	0.87	1,214	0.79
Algeria	61	59	0.97	52	0.85
Ecuador	1,859	1,590	0.86	1,444	0.78
Egypt	1,428	1,249	0.87	1,132	0.79
Spain	13,513	11,798	0.87	10,858	0.80
Estonia	284	272	0.96	262	0.92
Ethiopia	206	184	0.89	175	0.85
Finland	2,526	2,283	0.90	2,126	0.84
Fiji	120	112	0.93	103	0.86
France	32,701	28,780	0.88	26,734	0.82
Faroe Islands	41	33	0.80	25	0.61
Gabon	50	46	0.92	44	0.88
United Kingdom	48,255	42,665	0.88	40,564	0.84
Ghana	240	227	0.95	216	0.90
Guinea	26	24	0.92	22	0.85
Greece	1,459	1,365	0.94	1,298	0.89
Guatemala	1,884	1,612	0.86	1,419	0.75
Guyana	124	114	0.92	110	0.89
Hong Kong	16,747	15,351	0.92	14,355	0.86
Honduras	1,008	847	0.84	796	0.79
Croatia	328	306	0.93	295	0.90
Haiti	174	151	0.87	143	0.82
Hungary	1,928	1,733	0.90	1,670	0.87
Indonesia	10,011	8,496	0.85	7,589	0.76
India	38,417	32,619	0.85	29,193	0.76
Ireland	2,979	2,712	0.91	2,638	0.89
Iran	421	400	0.95	391	0.93
Iraq	288	268	0.93	256	0.89
Iceland	263	257	0.98	245	0.93
Israel	8,624	7,596	0.88	7,027	0.81
Italy	63,517	53,662	0.84	48,319	0.76
Jamaica	454	415	0.91	395	0.87
Jordan	426	353	0.83	312	0.73

Japan	40,495	33,350	0.82	30,899	0.76
Kazakhstan	91	88	0.97	85	0.93
Kenya	400	370	0.93	345	0.86
Cambodia	704	571	0.81	526	0.75
Saint Kitts & Nevis	86	68	0.79	66	0.77
Korea	28,967	24,427	0.84	22,923	0.79
Kuwait	219	208	0.95	199	0.91
Laos	61	57	0.93	51	0.84
Lebanon	333	320	0.96	309	0.93
Libya	31	29	0.94	25	0.81
Sri Lanka	1,545	1,336	0.86	1,234	0.80
Lesotho	84	69	0.82	63	0.75
Lithuania	463	434	0.94	414	0.89
Luxembourg	268	243	0.91	232	0.87
Latvia	214	204	0.95	189	0.88
Macao	1,120	853	0.76	752	0.67
Morocco	789	716	0.91	665	0.84
Moldova	94	89	0.95	85	0.90
Madagascar	242	212	0.88	191	0.79
Mexico	31,244	28,154	0.90	26,162	0.84
Macedonia	120	118	0.98	114	0.95
Malta	148	135	0.91	131	0.89
Mongolia	101	93	0.92	90	0.89
Mauritius	154	141	0.92	141	0.92
Malawi	61	56	0.92	53	0.87
Malaysia	10,200	8,726	0.86	8,054	0.79
Nigeria	285	277	0.97	260	0.91
Nicaragua	667	557	0.84	514	0.77
Netherlands	11,876	10,839	0.91	10,185	0.86
Norway	2,560	2,307	0.90	2,154	0.84
Nepal	791	680	0.86	562	0.71
New Zealand	3,420	3,130	0.92	2,854	0.83
Oman	112	104	0.93	96	0.86
Pakistan	4,707	3,990	0.85	3,574	0.76
Panama	669	623	0.93	597	0.89

Peru	3,492	3,024	0.87	2,666	0.76
Philippines	6,134	5,314	0.87	4,858	0.79
Papua New Guinea	93	87	0.94	77	0.83
Poland	3,623	3,319	0.92	3,174	0.88
Portugal	3,924	3,441	0.88	3,172	0.81
Paraguay	136	128	0.94	121	0.89
French Polynesia	180	162	0.90	156	0.87
Qatar	211	188	0.89	181	0.86
Russian Federation	2,049	1,877	0.92	1,802	0.88
Saudi Arabia	482	463	0.96	438	0.91
Singapore	7,119	6,257	0.88	5,824	0.82
El Salvador	907	779	0.86	700	0.77
Suriname	65	62	0.95	57	0.88
Slovakia	629	577	0.92	554	0.88
Slovenia	660	598	0.91	562	0.85
Sweden	7,567	6,650	0.88	6,214	0.82
Swaziland	62	55	0.89	53	0.85
Syria	121	113	0.93	110	0.91
Thailand	14,592	12,216	0.84	11,118	0.76
Trinidad & Tobago	516	488	0.95	467	0.91
Tunisia	631	583	0.92	552	0.87
Turkey	8,106	6,697	0.83	6,085	0.75
Tanzania	163	156	0.96	150	0.92
Ukraine	551	518	0.94	501	0.91
Uruguay	515	466	0.90	443	0.86
Venezuela	783	725	0.93	693	0.89
Vietnam	8,770	7,112	0.81	6,488	0.74
South Africa	3,754	3,526	0.94	3,272	0.87
Zimbabwe	61	57	0.93	57	0.93
Total	**972,782**	**799,201**	**0.90**	**730,113**	**0.85**

Notes: This table reports the number of foreign suppliers by country of origin in 2008 using three versions of the Manufacturer ID. "Raw" refers to MIDs as they appear in the import data; Not similar at "0.98 Match Score" and "0.97 Match Score" refers to MIDs modified using bigram matching algorithms with 0.98 and 0.97 thresholds, respectively.

Appendix I: Examples of the Bigram Matching Program

In Section 4.2, we describe the procedure whereby we collapse "similar" Manufacturer IDs into a single Manufacturer ID, where "similar" is defined as a score, calculated according to the number of matching bigrams within the Manufacturing ID. The procedure follows Wasi and Flaaen (2014) in order to calculate such a score. In Section 3, we have described rules of thumb to choose bigram matching scores in order to "clean" the MIDs. Here, we provide detailed examples of matches between MIDs and the associated scored, using hypothetical MIDs. Consider the following hypothetical firm name and address:

Quan Kao Company
1234 Beijing Lane
Beijing, China

Following the rules described in Section 2, the Manufacturing ID for this firm would be: CNQUAKAO1234BEI. Below we present seven permutations of this Manufacturer ID, along with their accompanying bigram matching score.

Table A1. Hypothetical MIDs and Bigram Matching Scores.

Raw MID to be Matched	Possible Matches	Difference	Match Score
CNQUAKAO**1234**BEI	CNQUAKAO**123**BEI	One Character Missing	0.9951
CN**QUAKAO**1234BEI	CN**QUAKAU**1234BEI	One Character Different	0.9917
CN**QUAKAO**1234BEI	CN**QUA**1234BEI	Second Word Missing	0.9830
CNQUAKAO1234**BEI**	CNQUAKAO1234**SHA**	Different City	0.9802
CN**QUAKAO1234**BEI	CN**QUAKAO**BEI	No Number	0.9723
CNQUAKAO**1234**BEI	CNQUAKAO**5555**BEI	Different Number	0.9381
CN**QUAKAO**1234BEI	CN**JIACHA**1234BEI	Different Name	0.5321

As can be seen from the above table, the closer the two strings are, the higher is the associated match score. Furthermore, our criteria of consolidating similar firms if the two codes

have similarity indices of over 0.98 or 0.97 seem reasonable according to the above standards: while some simple coding errors (such as missing one character in the name, or forgetting to use the second word of the firm's name) might be reasonable to assume as potentially occurring in the data, errors on the scale of wholly different addresses or firm names are certainly likely to be much less common.

Appendix II: Additional Statistics

We provide additional statistics in Tables A2 showing the total number of foreign suppliers to the U.S. using the raw MID, as well as the "no number" and "no city" versions, for the years 1997 through 2008. As can be seen, removing street numbers tends to reduce the number of unique foreign exporters by about 20 percentage points on average, while removing the city code only to reduce the total by about 15 percentage points. Table A3 shows the average numbers of foreign suppliers calculated using the raw, "no number" and "no city" versions of the Manufacturer ID, respectively, over the period 1992 through 2008 by geographic region of the country of origin. The reductions are largest in percentage point terms for Manufacturer IDs representing foreign suppliers originating in Asia.

We also investigate the concentration of imports among foreign suppliers using the Manufacturer ID, we compute the share of imports by country/HS2 pairing accounted for by the top 5 Manufacturer IDs (those with the 5 largest transaction values) in 2000. The choice of a particular year does not alter our findings. We find that for about half of the country/HS2 pairings, the top 5 foreign suppliers account for about 98-100 percent of all import value. Thus, using the MID we see that exports to the U.S. from a particular country are clustered among a very small set of exporting firms. However, this result itself is not surprising: indeed, these numbers are comparable to the share of export value accounted for by the top 5 U.S. exporters within a destination/HS2 category.

We use the export records only in the Linked/Longitudinal Foreign Trade Transactions Database (LFTTD-EXP) to compute the analogous shares for U.S. exporters.[23] We find that for about half of the country/HS2 pairings, the top 5 U.S. exporters account for 100 percent of all export value in 2000. Thus, we feel confident that the share of import value accounted for by a seemingly small number of foreign firms as identified by the Manufacturer ID is not indicative of serious problems in the construction of the variable, rather it is consistent with the well-known fat tail of the firm size distribution (di Giovanni and Levchenko, 2013) as well as the high concentration of trade among a small group of firms (Bernard, Jensen, Redding, and Schott (2007) document patterns for the U.S.). Also, using more disaggregated product categories, we do not tend to see large numbers of products being traded with an unrealistically small numbers of foreign suppliers. Between 1997 and 2008, for the approximately 9000 HS10 products imported by the U.S., on average, 88 percent have 5 or more (accounting for 99.4 percent of U.S. imports) and 96.3 percent have 1 or more MIDs associated with its transaction.

[23] See http://www.census.gov/ces/dataproducts/datasets/lfttd.html for further data description.

Table A2. Number of Foreign Suppliers, 1997-2008.

Year	Total Number of Foreign Suppliers				
	Raw MID	**No Numbers**	**% of Raw**	**No City**	**% of Raw**
1997	708,503	562,354	0.79	618,300	0.87
1998	723,496	575,040	0.79	632,137	0.87
1999	739,061	587,348	0.79	644,159	0.87
2000	783,252	622,066	0.79	681,428	0.87
2001	790,203	629,487	0.80	686,868	0.87
2002	814,048	645,629	0.79	705,218	0.87
2003	827,348	653,090	0.79	712,897	0.86
2004	856,844	675,006	0.79	735,221	0.86
2005	926,584	723,298	0.78	790,375	0.85
2006	1,000,429	778,145	0.78	845,528	0.85
2007	1,019,366	791,624	0.78	864,695	0.85
2008	997,973	774,118	0.78	848,319	0.85

Notes: This table reports the number of unique manufacturer IDs in each year. "Raw" refers to MIDs as they appear in the import data; "No Numbers" excludes numeric characteristics in the Raw MID and "No City" excludes the last three characters in the Raw MID.

Table A3. Average Number of Foreign Suppliers, by Geographic Region.

Year	Total Number of Foreign Suppliers				
	Raw MID	**No Number**	**% of Raw**	**No City**	**% of Raw**
North America (excluding Mexico)	89,677	77,392	0.86	85,555	0.95
Central America and Mexico	42,531	35,397	0.83	37,888	0.89
South America	25,295	19,438	0.77	22,481	0.89
Europe	284,069	235,302	0.83	244,025	0.86
Asia	299,490	214,047	0.71	250,231	0.84
Oceania	12,085	10,454	0.87	10,928	0.90
Africa	6,803	5,981	0.88	6,234	0.92

Notes: This table reports the average number of foreign suppliers calculated using three versions of the Manufacturer ID over the years 1992 through 2008 by broad geographic regions. "Raw" refers to MIDs as they appear in the import data; "No Numbers" excludes numeric characteristics in the Raw MID and "No City" excludes the last three characters in the Raw MID.