

# **Data Value Measurement**

-Findings through Estimates of Data Contribution to Added Value of Japanese Enterprises-

Institute for Information and Communications Policy (IICP), Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications (MIC), Japan

### **Issues Considered at the Committee on AI Economy**

- The MIC's Institute for Information and Communications Policy (IICP) established 'the Committee on AI Economy' in January 2019 to examine what kind of socioeconomics should be pursued in promoting the social implementation of AI.
- The Committee has been examining specialized and technical issues on data economic policies in the AI era. Data was regarded as a factor of production and its effect on productivity improvement was estimated.

\*The Committee on AI Economy 2020 Report was published in July 2020. https://www.soumu.go.jp/main\_sosiki/joho\_tsusin/eng/pressrelease/2020/7/21\_2.html



#### **Data Value Measurement Methods**

- The roles and characteristics of data are diverse. It is difficult to uniquely identify the value of data.
- Approaches for measuring the value of data are classified in the following three ways:
  - ✓ Cost-based Approach Calculation method which pays attention to costs related to the creation, management, and utilization of data.
  - ✓ Market-based Approach Calculation method which is based on the market prices of similar products or of users' willingness to pay for those products.
  - ✓ Impact-based Approach Calculation method where the effects (productivity, and revenue, etc.) of utilizing data is estimated.
- From the point of view of versatility and reproducibility of method application to different industries and countries, the impact-based approach was adopted and the effect of data on the added value of companies was estimated according to production function.

## **Analysis Model**

 The study positioned data as a production factor, as with other production factors (capital and labor), and conducted empirical analysis with the Cobb-Douglas Production Function modified to include data as a factor.

$$V = A_o K^{\alpha} L^{\beta} Data^{\gamma}$$

\* Estimate is based on the results of a survey with Japanese enterprises.

- (Survey target) 4,286 Japanese enterprises (569 responses)
- (Survey period) From February 2020 to March 2020
- (Details of Survey) Amount/number of data utilized by enterprises, and method used for data analysis, etc.

- Results from an empirical analysis highlighted the following:
  - ✓ The utilized data amount/number has a positive relationship with the added value as well as other production factors (capital and labor).
  - ✓ The added value increased by 0.05% when the utilized data amount/number increased by 1%.

- However, it should be noted:
  - ✓ That this reflects the current status of (not the change in) data utilization efforts, and that increasing the amount/number of data used does not necessarily lead to an increase in added value, and
  - ✓ That the results show the average between enterprises with more gains by data utilization and otherwise.

# **Remaining Challenges**

- Necessity of further study on the relationship between data and value generated by data
  - $\checkmark$  Studies to refine the model for analysis
  - ✓ Precise analysis that considers the difference by industry sector and production process
  - ✓ Continuous research to collect more data for diversified analysis

 $\Rightarrow$  These issues are to be discussed at the Committee on AI Economy from December 2020. The outcome will be published as a report next summer.

Approaches	Methods	Tools	Limitations	Issues
Cost-based Approach	<ul> <li>Calculation method which pays attention to costs related to the creation, management, and utilization of data (personnel, and time, etc.)</li> <li>It is based on the assumption that the value of data is worth the cost.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Calculating personnel expenses</li> <li>Calculating time costs</li> <li>Calculating security measure costs</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>This approach can't take into account quality and productivity.</li> <li>Since prices or quality of ICT equipment are diverse, the estimated value of data may be affected by other factors.</li> <li>It is difficult to intuitively envision a relationship between cost and value.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Which aspect of cost can be appropriately ascertained in order to define the value of data?</li> </ul>
Market- based Approach	<ul> <li>Calculation method which is based on the market prices of similar products or of willingness of users to pay for those products</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Market prices (data transactions, etc.)</li> <li>Representation preference method</li> <li>Case studies of M&amp;A, negative effects</li> <li>Experimental works</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Lack of data for estimates</li> <li>In the case of stated preference method, the result can be affected by the user's bias.</li> <li>The value could be perceived differently between the business side and the consumer side.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>How is data in general measured (not individual data)?</li> <li>Which point of view is more appropriate for data measurement, the business side or the consumer side?</li> </ul>
Impact- based Approach	<ul> <li>Calculation method where the effects (productivity, and revenue, etc.) of utilizing data is estimated</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Econometric analysis (production function analysis, and regression analysis, etc.)</li> <li>Experimental works</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Statistical estimates are needed.</li> <li>It is difficult to differentiate between the effects of one type of data and the effects of other types of data.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>It is necessary to clarify objects for which data is to be measured (the definition and the value of data)</li> <li>How can a good analysis model be established based on consideration of complementary elements which are necessary for data to generate value?</li> </ul>

# (Reference) Analysis Results

 $V = A_o K^{\alpha} L^{\beta} Data^{\gamma}, \ \log(V) = \log A_o + \alpha \log(K) + \beta \log(L) + \gamma \log(Data) + Industry Dummy$ \*Manufacturing/Non-manuf

Data variable	<u>Sa</u> mple size	Adj R <sup>2</sup>	Capital	Labor	Data
Utilized data amount (= total data amount x ratio of data used for analysis)		0.8343	0.44 🔘	0.50 🔘	0.05 🔘
Utilized data number (= total number of data x ratio of data used for analysis)	135	0.8157	0.34 🔘	0.55 🔘	0.07 🧿
Utilized data amount (FY2015)	258	0.8332	0.44 🔘	0.51 🔘	0.05 🧿
Utilized data number (FY2015)	135	0.8136	0.34 🧿	0.56 🔘	0.06 🔾
Externally acquired data amount (= total data amount x ratio of data acquired from outside)		0.8401	0.47 🧿	0.47 🧿	0.05 🧿
Externally acquired data number (= total number of data x ratio of data acquired from outside)	140	0.8193	0.35 🥥	0.51 🥥	0.07 🥥
Internally owned data amount (= total data amount - externally acquired data amount)	267	0.8379	0.47 🔘	0.48 🔘	0.05 🔾
Internally owned data number (= total number of data - externally acquired data number)	140	0.8134	0.35 🥥	0.55 🔘	0.06 🔾
Total data amount x data utilization rate (use area/type/processing method)		0.8334	0.44 🔘	0.49 🔘	0.05 🧿
Total number of data x data utilization rate	137	0.8150	0.32 🔘	0.58 🔘	0.05 🔾
Total data amount x data diversity (diversity of data acquisition and provision)		0.8537	0.53 🔘	0.42 🔘	0.04 🔾
Total number of data x data diversity	85	0.8576	0.41 🔘	0.49 🔘	0.06 🔘

 $\times$ Variables not described as FY2015 are values for FY2018.

The ratio of externally obtained data was corrected based on the situation of external data acquisition.

(Note) Significance level (0:1%, 0:5%)