Adeel Yusuf<sup>a</sup>, afaq<sub>5</sub>70<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>National University of Sciences and Technology, Pakistan <sup>b</sup>Affiliation not available

### Abstract

The modern portfolio theory explains the optimal portfolio concepts. The theory explains that investors will invest on the basis of maximizing their profit for their tolerated level of risk or determination of percentage of acids in a portfolio such that it fulfils the given objective, maximize return for a tolerated risk. Product complexity is directly related to the risk in export. This paper focused towards the detection of the export commodities in which investor can have the maximize profit by controlling the risk and later by using the past trade data, gravitational theory and complexity factor our system will predict and optimize the export of a country. The approach is tested for varying datasets and comparative analysis is performed that reflects the effectiveness of the proposed system.

Keywords: Export, Portfolio Theory, Product Complexity , gravitational Theory, Textile  $% \mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{COM}}$ 

### <sup>1</sup> Introduction

Countries do not remain in isolation, they have to import commodities to fulfil their 2 requirement either they are not produced in the country or in the shortage and in return they 3 export the commodities/goods which are surplus in the country or as a trade off their import 4 Also export they are related to the economic development and increase in Gross domestic 5 product (GDP). Generalized knowledge of trade is classified on Harmonized Systems (HS) 6 also knows as Harmonised coding of Trade data. Further classified 6 digit level i.e. First two 7 digit represents "Chapters". the second two digits designates "Heading" and the last two 8 digits designates "Sub Heading". HS code 010410, for example indicates Chapter 01 (live 9 animals), Heading 04 (live sheep and qoats), and Subheading 10 (live sheep's). Countries 10 applying HS worldwide to control and monitor of commodities used for collection of taxes, 11 tariff customs, collection of international trade statistics, transport tariff & statistics etc. [1] 12 During the recent few years, According to the World Trade Statistical Review 2017 [2] 13 by World Trade Organisation (WTO) 14

Trade indicators such as export orders and container throughput in major ports were up in the first quarter of 2017, suggesting stronger trade growth for the year, but the presence of significant risk factors also point to the possibility of less positive outcomes.

1.Due to continuing weakness in the global economy and low commodity prices the
volume of world merchandise trade slowed down to 1.3% in 2016 as compared to the previous
2.6% in 2016. This had a negative impact on global import demand

2. The world GDP growth since 1980 was 2.8% but ever since it has dropped down to 2.6
in 2016 from the previous 2.7 in 2015, which is way below the average.

3. Investment spending has been further weekend due to the slowdown in world trade,
 due to it being the most trade intensive component of import demand.

4.The merchandise exports have fallen by 3.3% to US \$15.46 trillion in 2016, although
the merchandise trade had a slight increase in terms of volume in 2016.

5. The weakest services component of 2016 was transport, which gives a reflection of fluctuations in merchandise trading, the recorded quarterly growth of commercial services trade was just 0.1 % in value terms in 2016 adding up to a total of US \$4.77 trillion.

6. The economies of developed countries stayed weak throughout 2016 although the developing countries imports had a good recovery in the second quarter from the 3% drop in the first quarter but they managed to recover their previous level by the end of the year.

7. There were several risk factors present in 2016 which pointed to the possibility of less
 positive outcomes, although trade indicators such as export orders were up during the first
 quarter of 2017

The most important thing Is to identify the gaps and optimize the system that leads 36 towards the better result that is, increase in trade with GDP, For this problem, The modern 37 portfolio theory explains the optimal portfolio concepts The optimal portfolio theory was 38 presented by Harry Markowitz[1]in 1952. The theory explains that investors will invest 39 on the basis of maximizing their profit for their tolerated level of risk or determination of 40 percentage of acids in a portfolio such that it fulfills the given objective, maximize return 41 for a tolerated risk and it clarifies us that it is practicable for different portfolios that have 42 changing levels of risk and return. Every investor must choose aspects that how much risk 43 they can afford to have furthermore expanded their portfolio as showed by this choice. The 44 graph underneath shows that how the optimal portfolio works. At the center of the curve 45 the ideal risk portfolio is resolved to be some place since you go out on a limb for a lower 46 incremental return as you go higher up the bend. though, generally safe return portfolios 47 are immaterial on the grounds that one can accomplish a comparative return by putting 48 resources into a risk free resource. 49

Risk mitigation, Estimating long term sales growth and Generating large amounts of 50 cash are the main objective of product complexity and these information are essential to 51 identify the gaps, predicting the future graphs and optimize them with integrating portfolio 52 theory. Product Complexity is the quality or state of being composed of two or more separate 53 or analyzable items, parts, or symbols categorized into Multiplicity and Relatedness of the 54 product. Number of components, Extent of interaction and Degree of product novelty are the 55 factors representing Product Complexity. There is a growing emphasis on product design. 56 The results of product in portfolio are more different and targeted to a more refined market 57 segment. Using Theory Performs Frontier (TPF) and Transaction Cost Economics (TCE) 58 as theoretical framework propositions can be constructed that, when tested will advance Π 59 the theoretical understanding of the impacts of the product complexity on operations. 60

Product complexity has direct and indirect impacts on trade. It is the state of possessing
a multiplicity of elements manifesting relatedness. Meaning to assemble a product, each and
every part is required. Hence the more parts in a product the greater the risk of discrepancies.

As we increase the product complexity of a product we also tend to increase the lifecycle 64 cost of that product. Several researchers have found that there is an increase in the direct 65 costs due to the increase in product complexity. The more complex a certain product is 66 the more costly and complicated it becomes, which increases the direct costs associated 67 with production and development, Eg the Time, product analysis etc. The more complex 68 and lengthy a product life cycle is the more time it takes for the company to develop the 69 product and the greater the risk of mistakes because the number of functions increase as the 70 complexity increases. Not only is the productions cycle increased with product complexity 71 but so is the cost, quality, services and customer satisfaction. The set up costs become 72 There will be a significant increase higher hence the need for more training and capital. 73 in the material costs and labor costs. There are also several indirect costs associated with 74 product complexity. Figuring them out tend to be more difficult. They may include 1. 75 Increasing difficulty of balancing the assembly lines and product scheduling. 2. The need 76 for higher quality control arises because we are increasing the components of the product so 77 each and every one needs to be checked. 3. Decrease in flexibility during development and 78 manufacturing. Other factors that can be included are Time and Capital spent on training, 79 Loss of economies of scale, Inventory holding costs, Time and Capital spent on training and 80 learning etc 81

The test dataset utilized for this work is the database of United Nations International Trade Statistics. Annual international trade statistic data including details of commodities category with partner country are provided to United Nation Static Division (UNSD) by more than 170 countries. It is the biggest repository of International Trade data. According to policy on use of comtrade data clause 3 & 16 by United Nation Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistic division are permissible. It contains more than 3 billion trade data record since 1962.

- 89
- 90

91

92

93

# 94 BACKGROUND/ RELATED WORK:

Li Xia, Guo Yaomei and Song Weiwei have Forecasted Textile and Garment Exports Based on Holt Model in 2010 [4]. They Predicted China Export Using export data from 1992 to 2008 to predict 2009 and 2010 and by using Trade data 1992 to 1999 they predicted 2000 and 2001 for verifying prediction accuracy. If verified Using export data till 2008 predict 2009 and 2010 and verify error in an allowed range Similarly Pedro Uribe, C. G. de Leeuw and H. Theil [5] have done information approach to the prediction of inter-regional Trade flows in 1966. They have separated the world into n areas and took add up to exports to and add up to imports from every locale and connected RAS method and the forecast
methodology to import and fare information of the years 1938, 1948, 1951-52 and 1959-60 of
the accompanying 8 districts i.e. North America ,Latin America, Germany ,Other E.E.C.
nations ,) United Kingdom Other E.F.T.A. nations ,Communist nations and Rest of the
world.

Fanxing Kong, Xia Li, Yingchun Liu and Yingbo Qin forecast china export by Applying GM(1,1) model. They have taken the trade data from 1999 to 2008 to verify the model and showed the prediction accuracy of the model is better. They predicted for the next three to five years and find out garment still grow rapidly in three to five years. Garments of china not only enhance in quality but also enlarge the investment in design, quality, brand to compete the garment industry.

113

<sup>114</sup> Zhang Dabin, Zhu Hou, Zhang Jingguang forecast custom export of China based on <sup>115</sup> Grey theory. They have utilized the Hubei Province China export data from 2000 to 2008 <sup>116</sup> and predicted 2009, they showed GM model can forecast export of Hubei Province better <sup>117</sup> than econometric model, Financial crisis on global economy has effect these years however <sup>118</sup> Chinese government can export trade by changing policies and accommodate enterprises <sup>119</sup> and provide opportunities to investor to invest and build friendly relationship with main <sup>120</sup> industries of developed countries.

Yan Xie and Yan Xie forecast of the total volume of trade based on optimized genetic 121 algorithm on grey modelling. Advancement of outside exchange of any nation's monetary 122 development is critical. The import-send out exchange has the vital advancement impact to 123 the nation's financial improvement, and it is of incredible essentialness for defining logically 124 the technique and the strategy of the planned improvement between assets, condition and 125 economy that to adequately estimate the aggregate sum of import and send out exchange. 126 A technique in view of hereditary calculation streamlining displaying process is presented 127 in this paper. This technique makes full utilization of the benefits of the Grey model 128 estimate and qualities of hereditary calculation to discover worldwide enhancement. So the 129 model presented is more precise. As per information from an area, the GM (1, 1) show 130 for anticipating the aggregate volume of import-send out exchange was given in view of the 131 dark framework speculations and hereditary calculation. The outcome shows that the model 132 can be utilized as the aggregate volume of import-send out exchange a successful device for 133 guaging. They have taken the trade data of one of the china province from 1989 to 2004 134 and predicted 2005 to 2007 they have decreased the error from 33.68%, 43.61%, 51.10% to 135 6.82%, 2.40, 9.04 for the year 2005, 2006, 2007 accordingly. In end they gave the conclusion If 136 the parameters u and a of grey model is optimised by genetic algorithm, GM(1,1) model 137 accuracy for medium and long term increased. 138

<sup>139</sup> Chi-Chen Wang, Yi-Hsien Tu, Hsien-Lun Wong gives the comparison between MFTS <sup>140</sup> and traditional time series modelling to forecast china exports and later on they have ap-<sup>141</sup> plied the same techniques on the export of Taiwan. They have taken the data from state <sup>142</sup> administration of foreign exchange from January 1995 to October 2002, They have pre-<sup>143</sup> dicted MFTS prediction is more accurate for short term forecasting than traditional time <sup>144</sup> series while one variable MFTS model perform better forecasting accuracy than multi vari-

able. They have applied the data on ARIMA, ARMA Two Factor model, Heuristic model 145 and Markovitz model and give a comparative analysis on all these models. Heuristic model 146 shows the best forecasting result followed by Markowitz model. MFTS proposed includes 147 three models: Two factor model, Heuristic model, and Markov model. In China export data 148 they have taken the data from January 1995 to October 2002, subdivided into January 1998 149 to October 2002 and January 2000 to October 2002 and provided the comparison in divided 150 form to give a forecasting analysis on long term as well as short term. In other paper writer 151 have taken the Taiwan trade data from January 1990 to April 2007 and subdivided into 3 152 categories. (II) August 1998 to April 2007 (III) December 2002 to April 2007 (IV) February 153 2005 to April 2007. The MSE value of ARIMA model is the lowest in (III and IV), the MFTS 154 model performs better prediction ARIMA model has better forecasting ability in long-term 155 period MFTS model performs better prediction ability for a short-term data than long-term. 156 Li Xia, Guo Yaomei and Song Weiwei have Forecasted Textile and Garment Exports 157 Based on Holt Model in 2010 [4]. They Predicted China Export Using export data from 1992 158 to 2008 to predict 2009 and 2010 and by using Trade data 1992 to 1999 they predicted 2000 159 and 2001 for verifying prediction accuracy. If verified Using export data till 2008 predict 160 2009 and 2010 and verify error in an allowed range Similarly Pedro Uribe, C. G. de Leeuw 161 and H. Theil [5] have done information approach to the prediction of inter-regional Trade 162 flows in 1966. They have separated the world into n areas and took add up to exports 163 to and add up to imports from every locale and connected RAS method and the forecast 164 methodology to import and fare information of the years 1938, 1948, 1951-52 and 1959-60 of 165 the accompanying 8 districts i.e. North America, Latin America, Germany, Other E.E.C. 166 nations,) United Kingdom Other E.F.T.A. nations, Communist nations and Rest of the 167 world. 168

To comprehend example of exchange a globalized world, business analysts tend to utilize 169 the gravity model. This was first displayed in 1962 by Jan Tinbergen, who suggested that 170 the span of reciprocal exchange streams between any two nations can be approximated by 171 utilizing the 'gravity equation', which is gotten from Newton's theory of gravitation. Relative 172 size is dictated by the present GDP, and financial vicinity is controlled by profession costs – 173 the all the more monetarily "distant" the more prominent the trade costs. Thomas Chaney 174 in 2011[7] gives the brief explanation on the Gravity Equation in International trade, similar 175 papers regarding gravity model have been written [8][9] Despite all no previous work with 176 respect to export opportunity decision based on predictive return vs risks has been carried 177 out. 178

- 179
- 180

181

## 182 PROPOSED ALGORITHM /



Figure 1: This is a caption

Suppose there are N commodities let  $r_{ct}$  be the return at time t on a invested as per 183 dollar in a commodity ; let  $d_{ct}$  be the rate of return of commodity **C** at time t; Let  $W_c$  be 184 the weight-age of investment in commodity **C**. Then the overall return **R** of the portfolio is:  $R = \sum_{(t=1)}^{[}?] \sum_{(c=1)}^{N} d_{ct} r_{ct} W$ 185 186

187 
$$R = \sum_{(c=1)}^{N} W_c \sum_{(t=1)}^{[r]} ?] d_{ct} r_{ct}$$

188

 $R_c = \sum_{(t=1)}^{[}?] d_{ct} r_{ct}$  is the return of  $c^{th}$  commodity Therefore  $R = \Sigma X_c R_c$ , In this equation  $X_c$  and  $R_c$  are independent. Since  $X_c \ge 0$  for all C and  $\Sigma X_c = 1$  for maximize return.  $\sum_{(a=1)}^{K} X_{c_a} = 1$ 189 190 191 For several investment amount  $a = 1, \ldots, K$  for maximum returns. 192 193 Let X be the random variable, suppose X series of finite number value  $x_1, x_2, ..., x_N$ 194 Suppose the probability that  $X = x_1$  be  $p_1$  and  $X = x_2$  be  $p_2$ . 195 Tηε Εξπεςτεδ αλυε ορ  $\mu(\mu \epsilon a \nu)$  οφ X δεφινεδ ας: 196

 $E = p_1 x_1 + p_2 x_2 + \ldots + p_N x_N$ 197

#### The Variance of X defined as: 198

 $V = p_1(x_1 - E)^2 + p_2(x_2 - E)^2 + [?] \dots + p_N(x_N - E)^2$ 199

V is the average square deviation of X from its m mean, we can calculate standard 200 deviation as  $s = \sqrt{V}$  and the coefficient of variation,  $\overline{E}$ 201

Suppose  $Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_N$  are a number of random variable, If Y is the weighted sum 202 of  $Y_i$  then, 203

 $Y = a_1 Y_1 + a_2 Y_2 + [?] \dots + a_n Y_N$ 204

 $E(Y) = a_1 E(Y_1) + a_2 E(Y_2) + [?] \dots + a_N E(Y_N)$ 205

Above equation is Expected value of the weighted sum of random variable, proof b 206

For variance we define co-variance  $s_{ij}$  between  $Y_i\& Y_j$  as: 207

208 
$$s_{ij} = E[Y_i - E(Y_i)][Y_j - E(Y_j)]$$

The co-variance between two random variable is equal to the correlation  $r_{ij}$  times the 209 standard deviation of two variable 210

$$s_{ij} = r_{ij} s_i s_j$$

Variance of weighted sum is: 212

 $V(Y) = \sum_{(i=1)}^{N} a_i^2 V(W_i) + 2 \sum_{(i=1)}^{N} \sum_{(i>1)}^{N} a_i a_j s_{ij}$ We know  $Y_i$  is  $s_{ii}$  then, 213

214

215 
$$V(Y) = \sum_{(i=1)}^{N} \sum_{(j=1)}^{N} a_i a_j s_{ij}$$

Let  $R_c$  is the return on the  $c^{th}$  commodity. Let  $m_c$  be the expected value of  $R_c$ .  $s_{cs}$  = 216 co-variance between  $R_c\& R_s$ 217

 $s_{cc}$  = variance of  $R_c$ ;  $W_c$  = percentage weight-age of investor of  $R_c$  then,  $R = \Sigma R_c W_c$ 218 The  $R_c$  similarly R are random variable and return (R) on the portfolio is a weighted 219 sum of  $R\& R_c$ .  $W_c$  are the percentage of investment.  $\Sigma W_c = 1$  shows sum of all 220 investment is equal to 1. Therefore Expected Return & Variance of the portfolio is: 221

222 
$$E = \sum_{(c=1)}^{N} W_c m_c$$
  
223  $V = \sum_{(c=1)}^{N} \sum_{(s=1)}^{N} s_{cs} W_c W_s$ 

#### **IMPLEMENTATION AND RESULTS:** 224

225

We have extracted the data of 10 years of Pakistan export, We have seen that more than 226 of 50% of Pakistan export is textile, We have extracted the required data, After that we 227 have applied filters to extract the top 27 commodity of Pakistan textile, We have extracted 228 the data of 10 years of the top 27 Pakistan textile commodities. 229

After extraction we have use our algorithm to calculate the return of the specified years 230 and predict the future returns from the past returns and product complexity factors. The 231 Top Export Commodities are : 232

233

Commodities exported by Pakistan to wold Data of last 10 years: 234

#	Product	Description						
	Code							
1	620342	MENS, BOYS TROUSERS & SHORTS, OF COTTON, NOT KNIT						
		TRADE						
2	520512	Cotton yarn $\gtrsim\!85\%$ single uncombed 714-232 dtex, not ret						
3	630260	Toilet or kitchen linen, of cotton terry towelling						
4	620462	Womens, girls trousers & shorts, of cotton, not knit						
5	630231	Bed linen, of cotton, nes						
6	630221	Bed linen, of cotton, printed, not knit						
$\overline{7}$	611020	Pullovers, cardigans etc of cotton, knit						
8	520942	Denim cotton $285\%$ $200g/m^2$						
9	611592	Hosiery nes, of cotton, knit						
10	630210	Bed linen, of textile knit or crochet materials						
11	520812	Plain weave cotton, $285\% 100-200$ g/m2						
12	610910	T-shirts, singlets and other vests, of cotton, knit						
13	630710	Floor & dish cloths, dusters, etc, textile material						
14	610510	Mens, boys shirts, of cotton, knit						
15	610342	Mens, boys trousers & shorts, of cotton, knit						
16	520912	Twill weave cotton, $285\%$ $200g/m2$ , unbleached						
17	520932	Twill weave cotton, $285\%$ $200g/m^2$ , dyed						
18	520522	Cotton yarn $285\%$ single combed 714-232 dtex,not retai						
19	551341	Woven plain $285\%$ polyester + cotton, $170g/m2$ printed						
20	611610	Gloves impregnated or coated with plastic, rubber, kni						
21	630232	Bed linen, of manmade fibres, nes						
22	630222	Bed linen, of manmade fibres, printed, not knit						
23	570110	Carpets of wool or fine animal hair, knotted						
24	520100	Cotton, not carded or combed						
25	520511	Cotton yarn $285\%$ single uncombed $2714$ dtex, not retail						
26	520532	Cotton yarn ¿85% multiple uncomb 714-232 dtex, not ret						
27	610462	Womens, girls trousers & shorts, of cotton, knit						

Table 1: This is a caption

Com-	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
modities										
620342	13317356181	192868090	971153790.	9960191726.	7101048038	0812515426	.1745905240.4	<b>7</b> 78950266.	1673360133.	\$491990025.6
520512	11311011881	1264554398	1492970024	123553043	1867099708	.1699455761	.3559747589.0	\$455664257.	3492391383.	6494968137.1
630260	922757730.1	911970369.1	875382916.	\$36284835	870677805	.2779785816	.6695722891.3	3708975237	590268216.	532640627.4
620462	858619748.1	801194853.3	3737419177.	3596323297.	492903494	.5383046342	.7319603423.2	<b>B</b> 21786090.	301805648	313878123.4
630231	724780316	786339308.7	664658938.	7591545614.	9752807409	.3516041066	.365372907.0	598452941.	2564674912.	\$14339089.2
630221	571560935.4	581987204.8	372584712.	<b>&amp;</b> 60713804.	9485993233	.9424764790	371568513.8	406697908.	2398367938.	<b>3</b> 299188216
611020	506200781.2	517129419.6	3438980647	411459543.	444154530	.2370614822	.B44191295.8	<b>3</b> 67595379.	6400288826.	7451279169.5
520942	405691693.2	409462151.2	2427876670.	<b>32</b> 12038955.	867196950	.@78998551	.7231595033.3	370798144.	347361566.	227958412
611592	310416447.9	804296367.2	<b>2</b> 98594001.	230747836.	2263186090	288599547	.2247539592	241705325.	<b>@</b> 09029222.'	202735337.7
630210	300248670 2	289099872.9	<b>2</b> 44669865.	<b>@</b> 24711586.	273900513	.3274641895	.3253707393.9	<b>2</b> 46261013.	3203987281.	199092825.9
520812	275329729.8	313516402	314942346.	272671555.	286988853	.1192458261	.6182237965	200282426.	3175180278.	849750938.9
610910	274168018.9	250696596.5	<b>2</b> 63715783.	<b>2</b> 59177269.	409822334	.3299575795	.1269279402.0	300509245.	<b>@</b> 62971599.	263721993.7
630710	252424914.9	228353353.1	229138262.	<b>2</b> 29311343.	2226139356	.3189558051	.1151186531.	188862508.	6180890288.	5173802018.7
610510	227669376.9	245504966.9	<b>2</b> 25463003.	<b>@</b> 49229271.	6328440956	.9279756967	.1213568088.'	277414445.	B22269540.	3299787508.2
610342	194296815.7	148760846.8	94031690.5	786098747.9	191568184.2	2371083198.1	462721515.94	54135390.9	747271152.6	546601758.68
520912	180201307.6	220354685.1	260785867.	<b>32</b> 48256795.	4235507936	.9.45479978	.1102703694.2	221638903.	998556744.8	9105751765.8
520932	151815261.7	138185864.2	256960118.	<b>4</b> 32268335.3	430617002	.689547939.6	552872880.6	69115786.7	<b>4</b> 8798554.63	235253547.89
520522	136891771.2	172338360.3	3188884220.	892866817.	3267739815	.2258359766	.7215275752.0	234424132.	<b>2</b> 33106051.	<b>2</b> 29004207.4
551341	136544738.1	191354099.3	195381258.	265825542	189203228	.3156790282	.240227494.5	186453188.	473496692.	1143382062.5
611610	135894708.4	130374048.2	209708621.	<b>1</b> 91072662.6	6127150077	.495280308.1	1759359249.8	85892655.8	<b>7</b> 67675539.5'	54434855.81
630232	126799188.5	146383559.5	132680001.	5124661782.	6140551875	.997426114.2	27140559560.9	126271188.	5128025028.	5124366413
630222	121701628.9	248265149.5	180695579	168646824.	5211277939	.273270512	.251980133.5	244467460.	6135371584	140007057.4
570110	121553512.9	155431095	152122427.	5155822687.	6169220716	.5160205024	.270524125.	£40577083.	276544946.	<b>2</b> 75131400.9
520100	120322588.9	195801772.3	<b>2</b> 30378435.	1426126337	364516610	.2249820648	.9180553306.0	<b>1</b> 38553221.	66321356.5	<b>2</b> 57709701.21
520511	117736848.9	107297698.5	<b>2</b> 13498433.	5317013455.	4256793055	.7187968331	.5176426109.'	146200308.	469064577.	6154701892.1
520532	116549675.2	184851776.2	283273816.	6163149717.	3213848247	.3204969858	.254388786.	187730433.	7169557768.	266598974.2
610462	114339115.3	18010782.5	501217792.	<b>5</b> 92019236.1	197530983.1	7864585360.4	456373308.38	62533055.6	59422028.8	\$3362919.63

Table 2: This is a caption

237

238

239 **Results** 

### 240 Conclusion

The conclusion should reinforce the major claims or interpretation in a way that is not mere summary. The writer should try to indicate the significance of the major claim/interpretation beyond the scope of the paper but within the parameters of the field. The writer might also present complications the study illustrates or suggest further research the study indicates is necessary.

## 246 **Reference**

- <sup>247</sup> 1. World Customs Organization
- 248 2. https://www.wto.org/english/res\_e/statis\_e/wts2017\_e/wts2017\_e.pdf
- 3. E.g., J. V. Uspensky, Introduction to mathematical Probability (New York: McGraw-
- <sup>250</sup> Hill, 1937), chapter 9, pp. 161-81.

251