

Relative regional consumer price levels in 2004

Damon Wingfield, Consumer Prices and General Inflation Division, ONS

E-mail: damon.wingfield@ons.gov.uk

David Fenwick, Consumer Prices and General Inflation Division, ONS

E-mail: david.fenwick@ons.gov.uk

Kevin Smith, Consumer Prices and General Inflation Division, ONS

E-mail: kevin.smith@ons.gov.uk

National Statistics customer contact centre: +44 (0)845 601 3034

e-mail: info@statistics.gov.uk

Introduction

In November 2003 the Office for National Statistics (ONS) published estimates of regional price level comparisons.

The 2003 estimates were a partial update of a previous exercise relating to 2000, using price data collected for the Retail Prices Index supplemented by a special regional price levels survey. A survey of regional price levels was not possible in 2003 because of time constraints so in the many cases where prices were not available direct from the RPI they were simply carried forward from the special survey conducted in 2000.

The ONS has now produced regional price levels comparisons for 2004. Like the 2000 estimates, these are based on RPI price data supplemented with a purpose-designed regional price level survey undertaken earlier in the year. A number of technical improvements have also been introduced compared with previous estimates.

The construction of the 2004 estimates are based on:

- Relative price levels derived directly from recent RPI data collected from retail outlets throughout the UK (mainly food items, tobacco and drinks).
- Administrative data sources used in the RPI that include a regional dimension. These include a census of fares conducted by the Strategic Rail Authority and rents data from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM).
- RPI price-estimation models that can be used to generate regional estimates for mortgage interest payments and depreciation.
- Additional data collection via a purpose-designed regional price levels survey for items of expenditure where suitable data is not available from the above (mainly clothing, furniture, electrical goods and travel).

There are two main areas where technical improvements have been introduced for 2004:

- Allowing for the fact that for some services such as utilities, the service supplied extends beyond the regional provider.
- Regional weights for the owner- occupiers' housing costs have been introduced. In addition the calculation of mortgage interest payments and depreciation payments uses the new and improved house price index produced and published by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and the calculation of regional depreciation costs uses an improved series for land prices.

Even with these improvements the comparisons presented in this article still need to be interpreted with care. Last year we stated that any regional differences in average prices overall of less than one percentage point should not be given any weight. We still judge this to be the case. We would also advise against reading too much into individual differences larger than this but rather the figures should be used to provide an overall picture of how prices generally vary across different parts of the UK. The calculation of standard errors is not possible.

Basic methodology

The basic approach to calculating regional price level differences is to measure the cost of purchasing a common basket of goods and services (in this case, the RPI “basket”) in each region and express that cost relative to buying the same basket nationally. That is, how much more (or less) does it cost to buy the basket in one particular region, compared with a UK average cost for it.

As with the RPI, it is not possible to price everything that consumers spend their money on, nor is it possible to collect prices from every single outlet or service provider that consumers make purchases from. Therefore we sample commodities, locations, outlets and service providers. The major difference compared with the RPI is that the regional price levels comparisons are designed to compare prices of a basket of goods and services at one particular point in time in different parts of the UK, whereas the RPI measures the difference in prices of that basket throughout the UK over a period of time. Therefore to be able to compare prices at one point in time, it is important to ensure that the prices being compared across regions relate to identical goods and services so that observed differences in relative prices are due to price alone. For instance, a comparison of the price of a branded shirt in one region with the price of an unbranded shirt in another region will reflect, in part, the fact that an unbranded shirt is cheaper. For this reason, it is advantageous to undertake a specially designed survey, with purposely tight item descriptions.

The methodology for the calculation of regional price differences is similar to that for the construction of the RPI, in that relative prices of individual goods are weighted together by expenditure. The basic building block for inter-regional comparisons is the average price for an item within a UK region compared to the national average price, whereas for the RPI prices at one point in time are compared to an earlier time period.

Further information on the calculation and aggregation of these price relatives is given in the *presentation of results* section.

Data sources

2004 regional prices survey

The survey was conducted during Spring 2004. Trained price collectors were sent to 65 locations across the UK where they collected about 80,000 price quotes for around 360 items. The majority of these items were from the household goods, clothing and footwear, DIY goods and catering sectors. This information was supplemented where necessary with prices obtained via a telephone and internet collection, for example some leisure services and insurance costs.

Five locations were selected per region, apart from London, where ten locations were visited in recognition of its size and the diversity of various shopping areas in the capital. Locations were selected within regions using a similar methodology to that used in the RPI, employing probability proportional to size sampling using number of employees in retail employment as a proxy for turnover.

Items chosen for the survey were those that are included in the RPI but do not have descriptions tight enough to ensure identical items are collected in each location and cannot therefore be used in the regional comparisons. Descriptions were chosen by using informed judgement to adapt the current RPI item description to make them suitable for comparing across regions. Sales data, retail websites and commodity specialists were used to ensure we selected identical and representative items.

The average price within each region for each individual item priced in the survey was calculated and the resulting averages were then weighted together by expenditure weights to give national average prices for each individual item. The price relative for each region was then calculated by dividing the regional average price for the item by the corresponding national average price.

RPI data

RPI data was used mainly to obtain food, drink and tobacco prices plus prices for some services. These are items that are well defined and highly specified and therefore facilitate like for like comparisons at any given point in time. Even with these well-defined items filters were used to ensure comparability. The prices extracted from the RPI database refer to the twelve month period August 2003 to July 2004.

Once the appropriate quotes are selected, the average price for the item is calculated for each region together with the corresponding national average price. The latter is an average of the regional average prices weighted together by household expenditure. A relative regional price is then calculated by dividing the regional average price by the national average. This computation is carried out for each month in the reference period (August 2003 to July 2004) and the average price relative across the year is calculated by taking an unweighted average.

Details of calculating relatives above item level are included in the '*presentation of results*' section.

Special Cases

As mentioned earlier there are several categories of goods and services where regional price relatives are not obtained directly from the above sources. These are described below:

- *Actual property rents*: estimates were based on 3-years data obtained from the Family Resources Survey. Taking a three-year average reduces the relevance of the measure as an up-to-date measure of rents but is necessary to ensure adequate sample sizes. A different calculation was performed for Northern Ireland, which is not covered by the survey. This is covered in the limitations section of the paper.
- *Motor vehicles*: it is difficult to measure vehicle prices as the sale price is often different from the advertised price as it is dependent on the negotiation skills of the individual purchaser. Therefore, it is not possible for our collectors to obtain realistic price quotes, so we assume no regional price differentials exist.
- *Banking services*: national average prices are assumed as bank charges are the same regardless of the location.
- *Sea transport*: national average prices are assumed for these services because, for example, a journey from Dover to Calais is the same for all individuals regardless of their region of residence.
- *Regional mortgage interest payments and depreciation*: the national methodology used in the RPI was applied at a regional level using data on regional house prices from the new ODPM house price index. The methodology is described in more detail in Annex B.

- *Coach fares*: a sample for coach fares was drawn up from the internet using prices for travelling between locations. Two locations were purposively selected from each region (giving a total of 24 locations) and prices for the journey from each location to each of the other 23 were recorded. The regional average price was taken as the average of all journeys from the two locations with that region and the national average was an average of all 24 locations.
- *Air fares*: price quotations for economy travel were collected for flights from regional and international airports for a sample of short-haul and long haul destinations chosen in proportion to passenger numbers. Departure dates were around a month in advance for a Tuesday around the middle of the day. The sample size was increased from that used in 2003.

Presentation of the results

As with 2003, the overall price relatives between regions, ie the relative costs of an RPI basket, have been calculated from the section-level price relatives on three different bases:

- **National weights** - pricing the regional cost of the national RPI basket. This enables comparisons to be made of the relative purchasing power of the pound for a uniform basket of goods both between a region and the national average and between one region and another. The comparisons are not confounded by differences in the basket of goods being priced. However, the compilation takes no account of the differences in expenditure patterns between the regions.
- **Regional weights** - pricing the regional cost of the corresponding regional basket. This enables comparisons to be made of the relative purchasing power of the pound, for a representative basket of goods for each individual region, compared with what that basket would cost if bought at national average prices. Because the basket of goods being priced is unique to a particular region, inter-regional price comparisons are confounded by differences in the goods being priced. This means, for example, that if one region has average prices 5 per cent above the national average, and one 3 per cent above the national average it cannot be inferred that the average price level in first region is two percent higher than the second.
- **A geometric mean of the two** - this is a hybrid calculation that lacks a conceptual basis but is similar to the method used for the calculation of Purchasing Power Parities. It achieves some degree of comparability whilst allowing for some inter-regional differences in the baskets of goods being priced. Thus the purchasing habits of shoppers in the different regions are partially taken into account. Results for this calculation are included in an Annex.

The choice of calculation is very much a matter of judgement and depends on the use to which the comparisons are being put. For example, a national basket is more appropriate for comparing the purchasing power in one region with another, whilst the use of regional baskets may be more appropriate if a high degree of relevance is attached to the specific expenditure patterns in particular regions. A more detailed discussion of the national and regional weights approaches is included in Annex A.

It should be noted that none of the above strictly measures the relative “cost-of-living” in different parts of the country, which it can be argued would require account to be taken of, for example, differences between involuntary and discretionary expenditure. In addition, the calculations do not take into account regional differences in expenditure below section level.

In order to be consistent with the RPI, pensioner households that derive at least three-quarters of their total income from state benefits and pensions and high-income households where total household income lies within the top 4 per cent of all households have been excluded.

For each region, the aggregation of individual price relatives into a single price relative covering total expenditure in the “RPI” basket is a two-stage process. Firstly similar items are grouped together to produce prices relative to the UK average price for each RPI section level. This means, for example, the price relatives for different types of bread (white sliced loaf, white unsliced loaf, etc.) are weighted together to give an estimate of the regional price relative for bread as a whole compared with the UK average price.

The next stage of aggregation is to weight together the section price relatives, to produce an overall price relative. This is where the choice of calculation method (the use of a national or regional basket) comes into play. The regional price differences presented in this paper using regional “baskets” are based on regional variations in the basket at section level only. Any regional differences in expenditure patterns below section level are not incorporated. Producing regional weights below section level is not feasible because the sample size of the Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS) does not allow it and producing more detailed regional item weights would require a significant increase in the sample size of the EFS.

In 2004, for the first time, regional price relatives using national weights have also been presented using the internationally recognised COICOP (Classification of individual consumption by purpose) – this classification system is used in the construction of the CPI (formerly known as HICP). Items that are included in the CPI (but not RPI) are also included in this COICOP analysis and vice versa. For example, owner-occupiers’ housing costs and council tax are excluded from the CPI and so do not feed into the price relatives produced on the COICOP basis. Similarly the weights used are identical to those used in the CPI and are based on expenditure by all private households, foreign visitors to the UK and residents of institutional households. It should be noted that arithmetic means are used throughout, unlike the CPI, which uses geometric means for the aggregation of prices prior to weighting.

It is not possible to present overall price relatives for regional baskets on a COICOP basis as the corresponding weights are not available.

Results

The primary results for the full aggregation of the RPI are shown in Table 1 with columns for:

- national weights;
- regional weights; and
- COICOP classification with national weights.

In each case the results compare average regional prices against a UK average price benchmark of 100.

Table 1: Average price in each region, relative to national average price (UK = 100)

	National Weights	Regional Weights	National Weights on COICOP Basis
North East	94.2	93.0	96.7
North West	96.9	95.9	97.3
Yorkshire and Humberside	94.2	93.5	96.2
East Midlands	97.4	97.0	98.2
West Midlands	97.8	97.4	98.2
Eastern	101.1	100.5	100.8
London	109.7	109.1	107.2
South East	105.3	104.7	103.2
South West	101.3	100.8	101.0
Wales	93.1	92.1	96.3
Scotland	94.5	93.1	98.0
Northern Ireland	95.8	95.3	97.2

In all cases London and the South East show the highest relative prices.

For the national basket, average prices in London are 9.7 per cent higher compared with the UK average. The corresponding figure for the South East is 5.3 per cent higher. The East and South West are the only other regions that have price relatives above the UK average. These two regions illustrate the point that although the South West has a higher relative, the difference between them is within the bounds of error margins because of limitations already discussed. All other regions have lower than average prices, with Wales being the lowest at 6.9 per cent below the UK average.

Regional price relatives calculated with regional weights are lower compared with those based on national weights. For example, the price relative for London is lower, at 9.1 per cent above average. Lower relatives for regional baskets are sensible and have a clear economic rationale. Where there is a choice, households will tend to purchase relatively fewer goods and services that are relatively expensive in their region. Clearly, this will not apply to all goods and services, for example people living in London cannot avoid spending relatively large sums of money on housing but for other expenditure, consumers can limit their costs by:

- restricting the purchase of goods and services which are relatively expensive locally; and
- taking full advantage of the potential savings offered by the presence of relatively cheaper priced items in their area.

Relative to a national shopping basket, therefore, a regional basket will be more heavily weighted towards those goods and services, which are relatively cheap in that region.

Regional price differentials are reduced, when based on COICOP, with all price relatives closer to the national average. In particular, prices in London and the South East compared with the national average are significantly lower. This is primarily because COICOP excludes owner-occupier housing costs, which is one of the biggest influences on the relative prices. It

drives the relatively higher costs for London and the South East and increases the variation in prices overall.

Table 2 shows the corresponding figures on an RPI basis, excluding mortgage interest payments, depreciation and council tax. As with the COICOP analysis, it highlights the effect on overall price differentials of the relatively high owner-occupier housing costs in London and the South East.

Table 2: Average price in each region, relative to national average price - excluding mortgage interest payments, depreciation and council tax aggregation (UK = 100)

EXCLUDING mortgage interest payments, depreciation and council tax	National Weights	Regional Weights
North East	96.1	94.9
North West	98.4	97.3
Yorkshire and Humberside	95.9	95.1
East Midlands	97.8	97.5
West Midlands	98.2	97.8
Eastern	99.6	98.9
London	107.1	107.1
South East	101.6	100.6
South West	100.0	99.2
Wales	96.5	95.8
Scotland	98.0	96.1
Northern Ireland	100.9	98.7

The corresponding geometric means of the regional price differentials based on the national and regional baskets (which allows for some of the regional variation in baskets) are provided in Annex C.

Annex D provides a more detailed analysis by the 14 standard groups of expenditure used in the RPI. Amongst other things this shows that the extent to which housing costs vary across regions. For example, costs in London and the South East are almost double those in Northern Ireland and the North East. Conversely the smallest regional variations are found in food prices – reflecting, at least in part, the national pricing policies of the UK-wide supermarket chains.

Finally, table 3 shows the results for 2003 and 2004 for national weights. For reasons expressed in the limitations section below, figures for 2004 are not directly comparable with last year.

Table 3: Average price in each region, relative to national average price, comparison of 2003 and 2004 results (UK =100)

	National Weights 2003	National Weights 2004
North East	91.5	94.2
North West	97.9	96.9
Yorkshire and Humberside	94.6	94.2
East Midlands	98.0	97.4
West Midlands	98.6	97.8
Eastern	100.9	101.1
London	107.6	109.7
South East	106.3	105.3
South West	100.4	101.3
Wales	93.7	93.1
Scotland	95.7	94.5
Northern Ireland	95.7	95.8

Rather than considering exact values in this table, the more useful comparison is when the relatives are ranked for each year – there is very little variation in the rankings.

Critical appraisal

Although the estimates of regional price differentials for 2004 represent a significant improvement on the corresponding estimates for 2003, there remain a number of caveats that need to be taken into account when using the figures presented in this article. This reflects the variety of different data sources used and their detailed manipulation. In particular:

- The RPI sample from which food, tobacco and drinks prices are drawn, is designed to optimise the estimate of the UK cost of the RPI basket rather than the regional costs. In consequence, the sample sizes vary considerably between regions and sometimes can be relatively small. This results in statistically larger variances in the estimates of average prices in the regions than would be the case for a purpose designed regional price survey.
- The process of filtering RPI data to find near identical goods in each region, to facilitate like for like comparisons, can significantly reduce the number of price quotes available for comparison and also involves a certain degree of judgement.
- The use of the national average price for a limited number of goods and services where there are known regional price variations but where the relevant price data is not available. The most notable example is rents for Northern Ireland where the average UK rent excluding London has been assumed.

It should also be noted that data collection and compilation issues detailed in the 'Data Sources' section, together with changes through time in the RPI basket and the detailed methodologies used to construct some of the underlying figures, preclude the figures presented in this article being directly compared with the corresponding figures previously published for 2000 and 2003. It is also important to note that such a time comparison is

further confounded by the representation of average relative prices against a UK benchmark of 100, as the benchmark itself hides a change in average UK prices over the period concerned. This means that the figures cannot be meaningfully compared to those produced in 2003, nor can they be used as a time series to infer regional inflation rates or deflators.

Future plans

The report of the Allsopp Review of Statistics for Economic Policymaking supported ONS's approach to the production of regional price level estimates, stating that "In future, production should be based on a cycle of surveys and updates according to a timetable that meets user demand". The review also stated that "The ONS should integrate change and level systems as necessary, but these should be aimed at operational simplicity rather than full coherence between price levels and changes."

These recommendations will be considered and taken forward in the context of a broader programme of work that is being put together in the wider Allsopp context.

Annex A: Formulae

This annex gives a more detailed description of the two basic approaches to aggregation:

- the national weights approach - using the same basket of items, and the same weights, in all regions; and
- the regional weights approach - using the same basket of items in each region, but using weights that represent local expenditure patterns.

The use of the geometric mean of the national and regional weights approaches is not discussed as it is merely a hybrid measure, incorporating both.

Using National Weights

The formula for aggregation in this case is as follows:

$$P_R \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{\text{Regional}} q_i^{\text{National}}}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{\text{National}} q_i^{\text{National}}} \quad (1)$$

where there are “n” items and:

P_R = overall relative for region R;

i = i^{th} item;

p_i^{Regional} = average price of good i in the region;

p_i^{National} = average price of good i in the UK (nationally);

q_i^{Regional} = number sold in the region; and

q_i^{National} = number sold in the UK.

However, weights are only available in the form of proportions of expenditure.

$$w_i \equiv \frac{p_i^{\text{National}} q_i^{\text{National}}}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{\text{National}} q_i^{\text{National}}}$$

where i is an individual item.

Applying this to (1) leads to a final aggregation formula:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{p_i^{\text{Regional}}}{p_i^{\text{National}}} \right) \times w_i$$

Using Regional Weights

In the case where we wish to take regional variation in expenditure patterns into account, the aggregation formula is:

$$P_R \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{Regional} q_i^{Regional}}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{National} q_i^{Regional}} \quad (2)$$

where there are “n” items and:

P_R = overall relative for region R;

i = i^{th} item;

$P_i^{Regional}$ = average price of good i in the region;

$P_i^{National}$ = average price of good i in the UK (nationally);

$q^{Regional}$ = number sold in the region; and

$q^{National}$ = number sold in the UK.

As for national weights, these are in the form of expenditures rather than numbers sold so the weighting factors are expressed in the form:

$$w_i \equiv \frac{p_i^{Regional} q_i^{Regional}}{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i^{Regional} q_i^{Regional}}$$

which leads to an aggregation formula of:

$$\frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{P_i^{National}}{P_i^{Regional}} \right) w_i}$$

In principle, this formula applies at both the item level and section level in the hierarchy of aggregation. However, as noted earlier, regional weights for the item level of aggregation are not available. At the item level, national weights are taken as a proxy for regional weights, and used in the regional aggregation formula. Effectively this formulation takes account of regional consumption patterns at section level only. The changes in the basket at the item level mean that any inter-regional comparisons will be a mixture of price and quantity changes.

Annex B: Methodology for Mortgage Interest Rate Payments (MIPS), depreciation and estate agents' fees

The calculation of price relatives for three of the components of housing – mortgage interest payments, depreciation, and estate agents' fees – are derived by applying RPI methodology at a regional level.

House prices

Experimental indices of monthly mix-adjusted average house prices by Government Office Region are available from the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), starting from February 2002. For periods prior to this, use was made of the series derived for the 2003 exercise from ODPM data. The method used is described below.

For the period to February 2002, the available regional ODPM house price data are quarterly and exist in the following forms:

- Simple average prices for Standard Statistical Regions (SSRs) from 1969 & Government Office Regions (GORs) from Q2 1992
- Mix-adjusted averages for SSRs & GORs from Q2 1992
- Indices based on mix-adjusted averages, SSRs 1969 to 199

For 4 regions – North West, North East, Eastern and South East - the coverage of the GOR differs substantially from the nearest SSR, so that there is no official series by GOR for the period prior to 1992. Annual house prices series for these GORs covering the period 1979 to 1992 were created by assuming that prices have moved in a similar way to the nearest equivalent SSR. The effect of this approximation is likely to be negligible, as these data have very low weights.

In addition, as the ODPM data are quarterly it was necessary to interpolate monthly figures. Monthly data points were interpolated by fitting a cubic spline, and each quarterly period adjusted to average to the original quarterly figure.

The series thus obtained were chained to the experimental mix-adjusted ODPM series, using the averages for February to April 2002 as link factors.

Mortgage Interest Payments (MIPS)

The MIPS model used in the RPI was adapted to provide estimates of regional price level and weights, using regional house prices to calculate the average payment per household with a mortgage in each region. The monthly regional price level for MIPS is defined as cost per week of the average mortgage payment per mortgaged household in the region, and the weight is defined as the same payment over all households in the region.

In order to calculate regional price levels and weights, we need to consider which of the parameters used in the RPI MIPS model will require regional data:

- a) Mortgage type – repayment or endowment
- b) Duration profile of mortgages
- c) Proportion of households which are owner occupiers
- d) Proportion of owner-occupier households who have been at the same address for under 23 years

- e) Proportion of owner-occupier households who have been at the same address for under 23 years, who have mortgages.

The following assumptions were made:

- a) & e) were finance factors kept constant in the UK MIPs model and so the same factors should be used for the regional models
- b) there was not sufficient data to estimate regional duration profiles so the UK rate should be used
- c) & d) are factors which vary regionally, and affect the regional weight. Thus regional data should be used for these parameters.

Expenditure and Food Survey data was used to estimate c) and d) but because of the small sample sizes the data were averaged over three years (July 2000 to June 2003), to provide more stable estimates. The resulting coefficients were standardised to make them consistent with the UK coefficients used for the 2003 and 2004 RPI.

It should be noted that this means that the estimates are not adjusted for the different mix of house types between regions.

Depreciation¹

Depreciation represents the expenditure that all owner-occupiers would find necessary to maintain their house at a constant quality, the intention of the RPI being to measure prices of goods of constant quality. Depreciation is measured at current replacement cost. It represents the notional amount needed to be put aside to cover large infrequent renovations required to make good deterioration and obsolescence and does not include routine repairs and maintenance already covered by the RPI.

The weight for depreciation in the RPI is calculated by multiplying a depreciation factor by the value of the capital stock. The depreciation factor (currently 1.4%) is derived from National Accounts' estimates for which there are no regional breakdowns. As there is no basis on which to estimate regional depreciation factors it has been assumed that the factor is uniform across the regions. Therefore the only regional factor which affects price levels is the average value of the housing stock to owner-occupiers in each region. In addition regional weights are affected by varying proportions of owner-occupiers in each region.

The regional house prices used, based on ODPM series, have been described above. ODPM have also provided a series for regional land prices, based on data from valuation officers. Monthly regional price levels, defined as the cost per week of depreciation to the average owner-occupier in each region, have been calculated as follows:

$$\text{Depreciation rate} \times \text{average regional house price} / \text{price of plot} \times \text{monthly regional house price index} / 100$$

Regional weights are calculated by multiplying the regional price level by the proportion of households who are owner-occupiers.

Estate agents' fees

The method used in the RPI to calculate the price index for estate agents' fees uses regional stratification, obtaining estimates of the ratio of estate agents' fees to house prices in each region. It is thus a simple matter to apply these ratios to regional house prices to obtain regional price levels. The regional weight for this item is obtained from EFS data, in the same way as for the non-housing weights.

¹ For further information on depreciation, see the RPI Technical Manual, available for download at www.statistics.gov.uk

Annex C: Summary of results (UK = 100)

This annex brings together all relatives presented in the paper and also shows the geometric mean of the national and regional basket.

	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2004	2003
	National Weights	Regional Weights	Geometric Mean	National Weights on COICOP Basis	National Weights Excluding MIPs, Depreciation and Council Tax	Regional Weights Excluding MIPs, Depreciation and Council Tax	National Weights 2003
North East	94.2	93.0	93.6	96.7	96.1	94.9	91.5
North West	96.9	95.9	96.4	97.3	98.4	97.3	97.9
Yorkshire and Humberside	94.2	93.5	93.9	96.2	95.9	95.1	94.6
East Midlands	97.4	97.0	97.2	98.2	97.8	97.5	98.0
West Midlands	97.8	97.4	97.6	98.2	98.2	97.8	98.6
Eastern	101.1	100.5	100.8	100.8	99.6	98.9	100.9
London	109.7	109.1	109.4	107.2	107.1	107.1	107.6
South East	105.3	104.7	105.0	103.2	101.6	100.6	106.3
South West	101.3	100.8	101.1	101.0	100.0	99.2	100.4
Wales	93.1	92.1	92.6	96.3	96.5	95.8	93.7
Scotland	94.5	93.1	93.8	98.0	98.0	96.1	95.7
Northern Ireland	95.8	95.3	95.5	97.2	100.9	98.7	95.7

Annex D: Group Level Results 2004 (UK = 100)

National weights

	Food	Catering	Alcoholic Drinks	Tobacco	Housing	Fuel and light	Household Goods	Household Services	Clothing and Footwear	Personal Goods and Services	Motoring Expenditure	Fares and Other Travel Costs	Leisure Goods	Leisure Services
North East	97.1	97.0	96.5	99.3	82.5	105.2	96.9	91.1	100.4	94.6	97.3	98.1	100.5	97.1
North West	98.5	99.5	96.7	99.5	89.3	94.9	98.5	97.8	102.2	97.6	102.1	90.6	100.3	97.5
Yorkshire and Humberside	97.6	95.1	95.6	99.0	84.5	97.5	99.8	94.6	96.3	96.3	95.5	89.9	99.1	99.0
East Midlands	100.6	99.8	98.0	99.6	91.6	97.1	103.1	97.5	98.4	95.9	97.5	101.2	98.5	99.6
West Midlands	99.0	99.5	97.8	99.4	92.3	97.5	97.6	99.8	102.3	96.5	100.5	92.2	99.5	101.3
Eastern	101.0	100.4	100.4	100.9	107.5	96.6	102.1	99.3	98.1	102.5	95.9	98.2	100.3	99.6
London	103.2	102.8	107.2	101.0	128.6	107.2	105.0	114.0	104.8	109.0	100.9	99.0	101.3	107.7
South East	101.3	102.5	103.7	101.3	122.3	97.7	103.1	105.5	99.6	101.9	96.5	97.5	100.1	101.3
South West	100.3	102.1	102.2	99.9	107.0	109.2	94.4	99.2	101.5	99.4	96.2	103.6	102.7	101.3
Wales	98.0	94.2	96.3	99.1	77.1	100.5	96.0	94.1	98.7	96.5	97.6	109.5	97.2	96.9
Scotland	99.9	103.3	99.0	100.5	77.3	97.6	102.5	88.2	99.1	101.3	97.0	99.3	102.3	100.8
Northern Ireland	101.9	102.2	98.0	99.3	67.9	112.6	96.2	88.5	96.7	97.2	121.8	99.6	100.5	100.2

Regional weights

	Food	Catering	Alcoholic Drinks	Tobacco	Housing	Fuel and light	Household Goods	Household Services	Clothing and Footwear	Personal Goods and Services	Motoring Expenditure	Fares and Other Travel Costs	Leisure Goods	Leisure Services
North East	96.4	95.7	95.8	99.3	80.5	104.9	96.0	88.0	99.7	95.4	97.0	96.6	99.2	96.1
North West	98.0	98.9	96.5	99.5	87.6	94.6	98.0	93.4	101.2	97.8	101.5	89.7	100.1	96.9
Yorkshire and Humberside	97.3	94.4	95.1	99.0	83.9	97.2	99.1	90.9	95.7	96.5	95.2	91.3	99.1	98.6
East Midlands	100.2	99.6	97.9	99.6	91.4	96.9	102.3	96.0	98.1	96.5	97.4	99.9	97.9	98.9
West Midlands	99.0	99.3	97.8	99.3	91.8	97.3	96.8	96.7	101.8	96.6	100.4	92.2	99.5	100.8
Eastern	100.7	100.1	100.3	100.9	107.5	96.3	101.2	98.0	97.5	102.8	95.4	95.3	100.1	99.0
London	103.0	102.4	107.1	101.0	127.1	106.4	104.1	111.2	104.3	107.6	100.9	94.4	101.1	107.0
South East	100.9	102.2	103.5	101.3	123.3	96.9	102.3	103.3	98.8	102.1	95.8	96.3	99.8	99.8
South West	100.0	101.9	102.1	99.8	107.0	109.5	93.9	98.6	101.0	99.7	95.0	102.9	101.7	100.7
Wales	97.7	93.9	95.7	99.1	75.9	100.7	95.2	91.8	98.3	96.8	97.6	104.9	97.1	97.3
Scotland	99.6	102.9	98.7	100.5	77.4	98.1	101.4	74.0	98.7	101.8	96.8	96.8	101.5	99.7
Northern Ireland	100.8	101.8	97.4	99.6	73.8	108.5	94.8	85.9	96.2	97.1	110.7	100.5	100.1	99.1