DOCUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND
AND NOT FOR PUBLIC USE

IMMEDIATE ATTENTION

MASTER FILES
ROOM C-130

0401

SM/88/82

April 12, 1988

To: Members of the Executive Board

From: The Secretary

Subject: Report on Meeting of Balance of Payments Compilers

There is attached for the information of the Executive Directors a report on the meeting of balance of payments compilers held in Paris at the Fund's Office in Europe from November 16-20, 1987.

As in the past, it is proposed to make the report available to the Inter-Secretariat Working Group for the Revision of the United Nations' A System of National Accounts (SNA) comprising, in addition to the Fund, the statistical offices of the European Economic Community (EEC), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United Nations, and the World Bank.

In the absence of an objection from an Executive Director by noon on Tuesday, April 19, 1988, the proposed transmittal will be deemed approved by the Executive Board and it will be so recorded in the minutes of the next meeting thereafter.

Mr. Bouter (ext. 8157) or Mr. Gill (ext. 7921) is available to answer technical or factual questions relating to this paper.

Att: (1)

Other Distribution:
Department Heads

Report on Meeting of Balance of Payments Compilers

Paris, November 16-20, 1987

Bureau of Statistics

International Monetary Fund

April 1988

Contents

Page

Contents | Page

I. Introduction

The meeting, which was held at the Fund's Paris Office, was chaired by Mr. John B. McLenaghan, Deputy Director of the Fund's Bureau of Statistics, who, on behalf of the Fund and at the request of Mr. Dannemann, Director of the Bureau of Statistics, welcomed the participants from the national offices of 23 countries and from two international organizations. (A list of the participants is shown in Appendix 1.)

In his opening statement, the chairman referred to the recommendations of the Working Party on the Statistical Discrepancy in World Current Account Balances, which included a proposal for a Fund-sponsored meeting of national balance of payments compilers to review suggestions put forward by the Working Party for improvements in compiling data at the national level, especially in areas contributing to the discrepancy. Mr. McLenaghan recalled that the emergence of a large negative discrepancy at the beginning of the 1980s had led to growing concerns that the policy inferences being drawn from aggregated balance of payments data were based on inaccurate information. Therefore, the establishment of the Working Party by the Executive Board of the Fund, in 1984, was designed to identify the causes of the discrepancy and to recommend procedures for improving statistical practices at the national level, as well as in the Fund's work on balance of payments statistics. The Working Party directed its work principally to the investment income accounts and the role of offshore centers, but had studied other areas of the discrepancy as well. These other areas are included in the accounts for shipment, other transportation, and official and private unrequited transfers. The report of the Working party was submitted to the Executive Board of the Fund late in 1986 and was discussed by the Board in February 1987.

The Executive Board concluded that the discrepancy did not appear to have called into question the work being done by the Fund in national analyses or in the World Economic Outlook. The Board, furthermore, concluded that the statistical gaps that were shown to exist could be addressed through the concerted work of national authorities, as well as through additional efforts on the part of the Fund, whose central role in these matters had been emphasized. The Directors agreed that the issue of improved balance of payments recording was central to the task of policy formulation in individual countries and of facilitating economic policy coordination at the international level. The Directors, therefore, urged national statistical authorities to adopt the specific proposals mentioned in the report, in particular, to use available sources of data on stocks of assets as a means of cross-checking recorded data on investment income. The Executive Board of the Fund stressed the importance of the follow-up to the work of the Working Party and, in particular, placed emphasis on improving balance of payments statistics and on upgrading the compilation of data in individual countries.

The second part of the agenda, the chairman explained, would provide an opportunity to review a number of methodological issues that had arisen in connection with the work involved in the revision of the United Nations' A System of National Accounts (SNA) and its harmonization with the Balance of Payments Manual. Earlier in 1987, the Expert Group on External Sector Transactions 1/ had recognized the importance of that work and had been successful in furthering this harmonization process. But additional work on a number of issues was needed by expert groups yet to meet on the revision of the SNA, and part of that work was to be undertaken by national balance of payments compilers. As the statistical methodologies had come of age, both producers and consumers of balance of payments statistics agreed on the need for progress and expected modern thinking and current views to be available as inputs to the reformulation of the existing guidelines.

This Report provides summaries of both the discussions as well as the conclusions of the meeting of balance of payments compilers. Section II contains the summaries dealing with the findings of the Working Party on the World Current Account Discrepancy and Section III contains the summaries dealing with the methodological issues. The appendices to the Report provide a list of the participants in the meeting, as well as a list of the discussion papers and of the background papers for the meeting.

II. Review of Findings of the Working Party on the World Current Account Discrepancy 2/

1. Direct investment income

a. Summary of discussions

Dealing first with undistributed earnings, participants noted from the Report of the Working Party that, for direct investment income, the vast majority of host countries and some creditor countries do not collect information on undistributed earnings. The Working Party had recommended that such information be collected through direct surveys. Moreover, recognizing the practical difficulties of conducting such surveys, the Working Party had encouraged national authorities to provide effective support, including legislation, if necessary, to empower compilers to obtain the required information.

1/ The Expert Group on External Sector Transactions for the Revision of A System of National Accounts (SNA) met under the Fund's auspices in Washington, D.C. from March 23 to April 2, 1987. The meeting was part of the series of meetings organized by the Intersecretariat Group for the revision of the United Nations' SNA (comprising the Fund, the EEC, the OECD, the United Nations, and the World Bank).

2/ The Working Party on the World Current Account Discrepancy was established by the Fund's Executive Directors in 1984. It was asked to investigate and recommend procedures to improve statistical practices in the field of balance of payments statistics. Its findings are given in the Final Report of the Working Party on the Statistical Discrepancy in World Current Account Balances, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., September 1987.

On that same topic, discussion paper BOP I noted that most members of the Expert Group on External Sector Transactions had agreed that, for the purposes of the balance of payments and national accounts, the current account should incorporate a parent company's share of the earnings of its foreign affiliates, irrespective of whether that share was remitted.

The Working Party stressed the need for coordination among national agencies, for example, central banks and statistical offices, that provide data on the components of the balance of payments. If a central bank lacks the necessary legislative authority to conduct an inquiry, its statistical counterpart, such as a central statistical office, might have such authority.

It was pointed out by participants that national compilers, in order to obtain data on direct investment income through surveys of enterprises, are often dependent on the accounting practices followed by individual companies. As these practices may vary from one respondent to another and may not be consistent with the concepts and standards of the SNA or the Manual, it may often be difficult for national compilers to produce data conforming to these standards. Efforts to derive data on direct investment income from exchange records are also unlikely to produce data that meet these concepts, while data on undistributed earnings of direct investment enterprises are not available at all from that source. In addition, there are numerous problems in assembling data by geographic area. As a result, the reported data may not be internationally comparable.

In addition, it was suggested by some participants that the introduction of an accounting standard for reporting by companies in their country would be very difficult, as it was expected that companies would not necessarily be prepared to follow that standard. In that connection, attempts to introduce a standard might not be cost effective.

With respect to the measurement of earnings, the Working Party noted that the accounts or records underlying the estimates for reinvested earnings may not be in full accord with the definitional requirements of balance of payments and national accounting. This problem was particularly acute with regard to unrealized capital gains and losses generated through exchange rate or other price fluctuations. Discussion paper BOP I noted that, while the Manual and the SNA were fairly explicit as to the exclusion of capital gains and losses from the measurement of income, compilers might wish to indicate additional guidelines that might be desirable. While most participants recognized the desirability of including reinvested earnings in the measurement of direct investment income, some were doubtful about the possibility of obtaining data in this regard. Also, one participant expressed a preference for excluding reinvested earnings from the balance of payments, showing it instead in supplementary tables.

Participants, furthermore, emphasized the need for more detailed guidelines on the concept of direct investment income in a future version of the Manual, preferably in line with those of the SNA, and the desirability of the Fund developing a standard questionnaire for collecting direct investment data that could be used as a broad framework by national compilers.

The usefulness of the OECD detailed benchmark definition of direct investment was acknowledged by participants. Some participants suggested that certain aspects now needed modification or updating and that this should be taken into account in developing a future version of the Manual.

With respect to the component of direct investment income that is distributed, the Working Party had concluded that the main source of the asymmetry could best be addressed through a reconciliation of the bilateral flows. Discussion paper BOP I suggested that compilers might wish to consider how such reconciliations could be organized in light of the requirements of confidentiality. In the opinion of the Working Party, the Fund could serve as a focal point for initiating such reconciliations. In the view of participants, however, attempts to improve the international comparability of the data through bilateral discussions would be difficult to effect, because data obtained from companies, more often than not, are of a confidential nature. Thus, companies would be discouraged from providing data if they were to be made available for other uses.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Most participants agreed on the usefulness of collecting statistics on distributed and undistributed earnings of direct investment enterprises. A number of countries are collecting such information in one form or another, and others have announced plans to do so. On the question of capital gains or losses, whether realized or unrealized, most participants agreed that such gains or losses should be excluded from the measurement of earnings. However, a number of participants emphasized the practical difficulties of adhering to this convention, as the underlying data obtained from enterprises may include gains or losses. Furthermore, changes in accounting practices could create difficulties for compilers.

(2) With regard to the means of collecting statistics on direct investment, including both stocks and flows, there was agreement that direct inquiries to enterprises provide the most suitable approach, although some countries continue to use administrative records, such as exchange records. In this connection, the question of cost effectiveness and resource needs was emphasized by some participants.

(3) The value of bilateral comparisons of data on direct investment was acknowledged by a number of participants. From the viewpoint of users, such information had application at the policy level. However, the question of confidentiality of data at the level

of the individual reporter was of crucial importance. In this respect, there was a concern that continuation of reporting was not assured if confidentiality was compromised. Moreover, while the Fund staff could play a role in facilitating bilateral comparisons of data, some participants expressed reservations on the extent to which this process could be carried out.

(4) Participants agreed that the Fund staff could take the initiative to develop a standardized format and a set of guidelines for a full reporting system on the international transactions and foreign financial assets and liabilities of direct investment enterprises, taking into account the OECD Benchmark Definition. 1/

(5) Concerning geographic allocation of direct investment income flows, participants agreed that measurement was confined to the immediate parties to a transaction.

(6) With regard to the collection of other information pertaining to direct investment enterprises, such as employment, value added, etc., participants were of the view that such efforts may be worthwhile but should not take place at the expense of balance of payments compilation.

2. Other investment income

a. Positions vis-à-vis banks

(1) Summary of discussions

As noted in discussion paper BOP I, the Working Party concluded that the discrepancy on other investment income formed the most important part of the current account discrepancy. In its analysis of that discrepancy, the Working Party had distinguished four categories of capital flow: positions vis-à-vis banks, marketable securities, other book assets and liabilities, and other official assets and liabilities. It had obtained from countries, through a special questionnaire, data on the income flows associated with these four categories. Data on banks' receipts and payments obtained in this manner had been compared with corresponding estimates derived from data on stocks of assets and liabilities covered by the Fund's international banking statistics (IBS) database and from estimates of yields on banks' assets and liabilities. The Working Party had found that little correction was needed for interbank flows of income, but that major corrections were needed for interest flows on non-bank assets and liabilities. While it was relatively easy to calculate estimates for interest payments, it was difficult to calculate estimates for the corresponding receipts.

1/ The Detailed Benchmark Definition of Foreign Direct Investment, OECD, Paris, 1983.

Participants generally felt that the IBS database was well suited to the task of reconciling the global asymmetry in the investment income account. They did not believe, however, that data on investment income for individual countries derived from IBS should be published by the Fund in presentations of individual countries' balance of payments statistics. Specifically, participants felt that the IBS did not provide an instrument breakdown that, together with relevant data on yields, could be used to estimate income flows.

In addition, participants considered that more information was needed on the methodology used in compiling IBS, including information on the residency status of accounts owned jointly by a resident and a nonresident, and of accounts of foreign-owned (offshore) banks. In order to improve the usefulness of the IBS data, participants suggested that the data should be broken down by sector, by instrument, and by maturity.

As to the procedure for the time of recording flows of investment income, participants were fairly evenly divided between the accrual and the due-for-payment recording. Participants agreed, however, that wherever possible flows of investment income should be compiled separately from fees and realized capital gains.

With regard to the use of banks' off-balance-sheet data, participants were of the opinion that confidentiality made such data rather unreliable and expressed their preference for data provided by principals.

(2) <u>Summary of conclusions</u>

(a) Participants emphasized the growing importance of the Fund's IBS as a basis for estimating capital and related income flows pertaining to banks' external assets and liabilities. However, they felt that, to improve procedures for estimating income flows, a more disaggregated presentation of the stock data compiled by the Fund is needed. This should include further details on banks' positions vis-à-vis non-banks, such as by instrument, by sector, by maturity, and by currency.

(b) Most participants supported the suggestions that the Fund should compile and provide to individual countries its estimates of interest flows for individual countries. However, publication of such estimates, even for broad country groupings, was not favored at this time.

(c) Participants noted that, in light of the experience to date, there had been limited success in the collection and utilization of information on off-balance-sheet positions of banks as a means of deriving data on foreign assets and liabilities of non-banks.

b. Marketable securities

(1) Summary of discussions

In its analysis of capital flows in the form of marketable securities and related income flows, the Working Party found the measurement of reported income debits to be acceptable, while reported income credits were considered to be undervalued. The Working Party had felt, however, that it was not in a position to recommend a procedure for calculating more reliable data on income flows. For that reason, it had recommended that individual countries might review their own procedures and might exchange data with other countries.

Participants generally felt that the measurement of income from marketable securities had been correctly identified by the Working Party as perhaps the most intractable part of the discrepancy. They did not readily see much scope for improving estimates for their own countries of transactions in and of income from those securities. In particular, the need to obtain separate data on resident and nonresident holders of domestic securities was emphasized. On the other hand, data on new issues of bonds taken up by nonresidents and on other transactions in bonds between residents and nonresidents through security dealers were available. There was a problem, however, in that the two sets of data might overlap. It was noted that, with few exceptions, countries generally resorted to estimating income flows on the basis of holdings of stocks and of yields. From a national standpoint, the likelihood of improving the data was slim and, since that appeared to be a universal problem, exchange of information did not hold much promise.

(2) Summary of conclusions

(a) Participants generally acknowledged the difficulties of compiling data on stocks and associated income on marketable securities. As indicated in the report of the Working Party on the Statistical Discrepancy in World Current Account Balances, this was considered to be one of the most complex issues in balance of payments accounting. The measurement of residents' holdings of foreign securities was seen to be a major gap in the availability of data. For countries for which such transactions are significant, bilateral comparisons of data on assets and liabilities positions may be helpful in achieving greater consistency. A limitation of such comparisons arises from the form in which these securities are often issued.

(b) Several participants suggested that the Fund could act as a center for the exchange of information on the practices of member countries underlying the compilation of data on marketable securities. In this connection, attention was drawn to the "International Securities Identification Numbering System."

c. Other book assets and liabilities

(1) Summary of discussions

The Working Party concluded that reported information on capital flows in the form of other book assets and liabilities and related income flows, needed little, if any, correction. Most participants indicated that data on export and import credits, other than from banks, are not available. It was noted, however, that a few countries do have data collections from enterprises that provide comprehensive data on trade credit. In view of the importance of this information, some other compilers are considering the possibility of collecting data on these flows.

(2) Summary of conclusions

With regard to statistics on trade credits (other than credits extended by banks), several participants reported on the practices employed to compile such data. It was noted, however, that in this area information is generally limited.

d. Other official assets and liabilities

(1) Summary of discussions

The Working Party concluded that the external debt data collected by the OECD and the IBRD were most useful in analyzing data reported by countries.

Participants briefly discussed the collection of data on official assets and liabilities and on associated income flows, and confirmed that such data are generally available.

(2) Summary of conclusions

Participants agreed that information in this area is generally adequate.

3. Shipping and transportation

a. Summary of discussions

Participants noted that, for the purpose of analyzing the global discrepancy in the shipment component of the balance of payments, the Working Party had sent a special, detailed questionnaire to several countries providing shipping services. On the basis of the response to that questionnaire, the Working Party concluded that the understatement of shipping credits was mainly attributable to the lack of reporting by several maritime countries whose residents operated large fleets. The implicit revenues to be attributed to these fleets, however, could not be related closely enough to the average revenue experience indicated for such vessels. Consequently, there remained considerable doubt about the shipping credits as reported by other countries.

In addition, the Working Party reviewed total payments for shipping services, i.e., payments to residents and nonresidents, which should bear a reasonable relationship to imports, and had concluded that both total payments for shipping services, as well as receipts for port expenditures, mainly for bunker fuel, were underestimated.

With respect to the residency status of enterprises operating transportation equipment, some participants felt that these enterprises are resident of the country whose economy is affected, more than that of any other country, by the transactions of these enterprises. They realized, however, that it may be difficult to use this criterion in determining the residency of those enterprises. Other participants felt that the residency of such enterprises should be determined by the residency of the owners, or charterers in the case of time charters, of the transportation equipment, which, in turn, could be derived from their tax status.

With respect to the suggestion that national compilers prepare and report data on shipment and other transportation on a gross basis, i.e., prepare and report receipts from and payments to residents as well as nonresidents, for the purpose of checking the reasonableness of the actual balance of payments entries, participants agreed that it would be useful to have such information. They noted, however, that such data may not always be available. In that connection, it was noted that data on sales of bunker fuel to nonresidents, other port expenditure receipts from nonresidents, and resident/nonresident transactions of airlines are usually available. On the other hand, data on transactions associated with traffic across land borders may contribute to the global discrepancy in the transportation account.

As to the recording of transactions of subsidiaries incorporated in offshore economies operating transportation equipment, a few participants indicated that they did not consider these enterprises to be resident of the country of residence of the parent company.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Most participants reported that in compiling data on shipment debits a first step was to estimate the total shipment component (i.e., shipment including resident-to-resident transactions) of the c.i.f. value of imports. It was noted that a large number of countries that prepare such statistics use them as a check on the reasonableness of the actual balance of payments entries.

(2) Many participants considered that sales of bunkers to nonresident carriers were adequately covered in the balance of payments.

Steps to improve the coverage of these and other port expenditure data were being taken by a number of countries.

(3) Concerns expressed in respect of maritime shipping were generally not reflected insofar as other modes of transport are concerned. Coverage was said to be fairly complete in respect of air transportation, but reference was made to inadequacies in the coverage of road carriers in some countries.

(4) Problems in collecting data on transactions relating to ships owned and operated by subsidiary companies abroad were mentioned by a number of participants. On the one hand, it was noted that, in most cases, it is difficult to attribute to a particular country the residency of enterprises operating ships under flags of convenience. On the other hand, duplication of reported data in respect of the shipment account and other services can arise because of the statistical treatment followed by some countries in the collection of statistics on affiliated enterprises.

4. Official unrequited transfers

a. Summary of discussions

As background for the review of this item, participants recalled, from discussion paper BOP I, that the Working Party had obtained from countries, through a special questionnaire, data on the composition of countries' receipts and payments of official unrequited transfers and had obtained from the OECD data available to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC). These data indicated that one part of the excess of debits was connected with the operations of international organizations, while the second part reflected the omission of pensions and taxes. The Working Party's attempts to reconcile donor countries' data in reports to the DAC with the corresponding data in balance of payments reports were, however, not successful. In order to compare data reported by recipient countries with data reported by donor countries, the Fund was requesting that the latter provide information in considerable country detail.

Participants generally agreed that, as suggested in the discussion paper BOP I, it should be possible to coordinate more effectively reporting countries' submissions regarding unrequited transfers. In addition, they considered that it should be possible to report, separately, development assistance and other official transfers. It was noted, however, that separate reporting of such details would call for a clearer definition of development assistance.

Participants, furthermore, indicated that it should be possible to report separately transactions with international organizations. Some participants also indicated that they could report transactions related to taxes, pensions, and renegotiations of outstanding credits, in particular those of the official sector. It was noted, however, that transactions of the official sector are often sensitive and, therefore, are not always reported.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Participants endorsed the suggestion that national agencies coordinate their country's submissions on development assistance to the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD (DAC) and on balance of payments statistics to the Fund.

(2) Most participants indicated that information on transfers vis-à-vis international organizations could be readily identified and furnished to the Fund, provided a listing of such organizations were made available by the Fund.

(3) A number of participants were in a position to provide separate information on transfers related to taxes, pensions, and debt forgiveness.

5. Measurement problems and the Manual

a. Summary of discussion paper

A major topic emerging from the studies of the Working Party was the connection between the overall presentation and discussion of the accounts now contained in the Manual, and the ability of national compilers, using the Manual as guidance, to have clear ideas of data requirements, sources of data, and appropriate estimating techniques. This topic was seen to be especially important in connection with innovations in financial practices, the abolition of exchange controls, and the limited resources for dealing with very complicated accounting for international transactions. For that reason, the Working Party recommended that the Manual should be written in clear language, that it should provide guidance to direct scarce resources and on data collection and estimation, that it should be integrated with the SNA, and that it should give attention to the collection of data on international investment positions.

b. Summary of comments

Participants generally agreed with the recommendations of the Working Party. One participant pointed out that it should be recognized that some of the new developments are covered by the existing guidelines, and that the distinction between major and minor issues is not always clear.

As to recommendations on sources and techniques for obtaining data and checking on consistency, it was suggested that such recommendations should not be too complicated. There was a slight preference for including these recommendations in a separate handbook on compilation procedures and practice rather than in a revised edition of the Manual.

III. Methodological Issues

1. The residence of enterprises

a. Issues related to enterprises engaged in production in international waters or air space

(1) Summary of discussions

The discussion paper on this topic (BOP IIa) concluded that the residence of enterprises engaged in production in international waters or air space, for example, transportation and telecommunication companies, could not be determined by reference to the criterion used in determining the residence of enterprises engaged in production on the territory of an economy. The fourth edition of the Balance of Payments Manual, therefore, suggested that various attributes, such as the flag of registration of vessels or the country of incorporation, or the residence of the owners of the major parts of the equity, of the corporation operating vessels, should be used in deciding the residence of the operators of vessels or other facilities.

In view of the large statistical discrepancy in the global account for shipping and transportation, it appeared that it was difficult to apply these criteria as determinants of the residence of enterprises engaged in production in international waters and air space. For that reason, the Expert Group on External Sector Transactions had decided to look forward to what the further pursuits of the study on the statistical discrepancy might yield in the way of guidelines that would result in more consistent statistics on the transactions of these operators.

Participants considered that the many criteria mentioned in the fourth edition of the Balance of Payments Manual, which probably had been taken from the SNA, were not particularly useful in determining the residence of enterprises operating in international waters or air space. Participants could not agree, however, on an alternative set of criteria. While the majority appeared to favor a single criterion, i.e., the residency of the operator, some were firmly opposed to that approach. The criterion that was most frequently mentioned as an alternative to the present guidelines was ownership of the equipment, except under time charter when chartering would be the relevant criterion; this was seen as an approximation to the notion of the operator. Other criteria that were mentioned were the payment of taxes and data availability. The flag of convenience or registration of the equipment, on the other hand, were declared unacceptable as a replacement for the present guidelines.

In addition, it was stressed that the criterion of choice should suit a country's analytical needs as these were perceived by the reporting country. In that connection, global compatibility was considered to be less important.

(2) Summary of conclusions

(a) Participants acknowledged that determining the residency of such enterprises was a difficult undertaking. The guidelines now embodied in the Fund's Balance of Payments Manual and the United Nations' A System of National Accounts (SNA) were seen to be not only too numerous but also lacking in direction.

(b) In order to develop a new set of guidelines, many participants emphasized the desirability of using the concept of the operating enterprise as the main determinant of residence. Others pointed to ownership and tax status, which, in combination, could serve as a criterion. In the application of the operating-enterprise concept, participants noted the need to include operations under time, as distinct from voyage, charter. In general, participants recognized that in present circumstances no single criterion was appropriate.

b. Enterprises temporarily engaged in production abroad

(1) Summary of discussions

Problems of principle arise for the determination of residence when an enterprise is temporarily engaged in production abroad. For example, when an enterprise manufactures equipment in one economy and installs that equipment in another economy a question arises as to the residence of that enterprise. Two answers are possible. First, a single legal entity could be divided into two separate enterprises, each of which would be regarded as a resident of the economy in whose territory its operations are carried out. In that situation, the costs and proceeds of the separate units would be calculated as if the units bought and sold at market prices, even though some, most, or all of what they receive from or transfer to the other unit of the complex of which they form part might be omitted from their records or entered only at nominal value. Balance of payments presentations would thereby reflect the allocation to each member of the complex of an appropriate share of any common operating costs, including head office expenses and charges in respect of, for example, equipment; the net income of the units would be shown as accruing to the economy in which the head office is located.

Alternatively, the entire output of an enterprise temporarily operating abroad could be attributed to that enterprise, with that part of its output sold abroad recorded as exports of goods and/or services of that enterprise.

As the present guidelines do not cover enterprises other than those engaged in installation abroad, a question about the coverage of these guidelines arises, as well.

From the discussion of this agenda item, it appeared that the recording of transactions of enterprises temporarily engaged in production abroad differs from country to country. Some participants preferred an approach under which a single legal entity is divided into two or more separate enterprises, each of which is regarded as a resident of the economy on whose territory its operations are carried out, while others preferred to attribute the entire output of an enterprise temporarily operating abroad to that enterprise and record as exports of goods and/or services of that enterprise that part of its output that was sold abroad.

Participants also had rather widely divergent views as to where the borderline between these two approaches should be drawn. Some defined the borderline in terms of the time an enterprise is engaged in production abroad, while others preferred to apply other criteria, such as the way an enterprise records the related transactions in its books, the potential for tax liabilities, the lasting nature of the operations, the legal form of the entity, the ease of compiling data on the transactions, the impact of the transactions on the various items of the current account, or the type of operations.

Several participants emphasized that harmonization of the borderlines used for balance of payments and national accounts purposes was important. For that reason, it was suggested that the borderline be defined in terms of a time limit that would serve as a proxy for other factors and that it should be applicable to all kinds of operations.

(2) Summary of conclusions

(a) Participants agreed that an important consideration in the review of the Manual and the SNA is to ensure a continuation of their uniform treatment of the residency of such enterprises.

(b) It was noted that country practices vary considerably in determining residency, in particular in identifying the borderline between resident enterprises producing services abroad and notional (direct investment) enterprises created abroad engaged in the production of services. Many participants agreed that the "one-year rule" as a determinant of residency, now incorporated in the Manual and the SNA only in respect of enterprises engaged in installation, could be applied to other activities. However, while the "one-year rule" could be a useful starting point, other factors, such as a lasting interest, are equally important. Some participants considered that enterprises providing consultancy services, for example, even for periods beyond one year, could be regarded as residents of the home, rather than of the host, country.

(c) There was a divergence of views on the treatment of enterprises engaged in construction abroad. Some participants favored for such activity a treatment that involved the creation abroad of a notional (direct investment) enterprise, while others preferred to attribute the value of construction to the home economy. A third approach, proposed by some, was to take a case-by-case approach based on the availability of accounts and other factors.

(d) It was recognized that the range of practices now in operation could lead to asymmetries in global balance of payments. It was agreed that the Fund should survey its member countries to determine country practices in this area.

2. The recording of financial and operational leases and of arrangements similar to financial leases

a. Summary of discussions

Discussion paper BOP IIb noted that, in moving from the third to the fourth edition of the Manual, the concept of ownership had been broadened to account for financial leases. These leases have many of the hallmarks of a change of ownership, by passing control over an asset to the user, while preserving legal title to the asset with the financing entity. Other international organizations--specifically, the European Communities, the OECD, as well as the International Accounting Standards Committee--also have adopted this broader concept, but differences between the definitions of financial leases used by these organizations still exist.

According to the Manual, a lease arrangement expected to cover at least three fourths of the cost of the goods, together with the carrying charges, is to be taken as presumptive evidence that a change of ownership is intended. The OECD definition provides that, to be treated as a financial lease, a lease arrangement should cover all of the cost of the goods, together with carrying charges. The International Accounting Standards Committee stops short of specifying a precise percentage share and defines a financial lease as "a lease that transfers substantially all the risks and rewards incident to ownership of an asset [while] title may or may not eventually be transferred."

A particular problem identified by national compilers was their ability to adjust data on financial lease arrangements reported by enterprises for the differences between the cut-off points enterprises have been using in their own books and the standard cut-off point used in the Manual. It was noted that, in practice, various cut-off points are applied under the domestic accounting standards in force in countries. In the absence of a standard cut-off point at the international level, however, a statistical discrepancy for the world as a whole is bound to arise.

Other arrangements that involve the transfer of an economic risk but that presently are not specifically referred to in any accounting standards on financial leases at either the national or international levels might also be recorded in the way suggested for financial lease arrangements.

Some participants were in favor of a common cut-off point for the purpose of distinguishing financial leases from operational leases, but others were opposed. It was recognized, however, that individual countries may distinguish between the two leases on some other basis and may report data that cannot be adjusted to conform to the standard cut-off point. For that reason, participants felt that the recommendation given by the International Accounting Standards Committee in Accounting for Leases (IAS 17) might be used until such time as that Committee provides a more detailed standard.

Participants pointed out that financial leases and arrangements similar to financial leases should be distinguished with reference to the risks and rewards connected with holding a piece of equipment. There might, however, be other conditions, such as the existence of a bargain purchase option and the option to transfer title of the equipment at the end of the lease term, that also should be considered in this context. In that connection, it was suggested that the Fund survey its member countries in order to determine the conditions that are taken into account in determining the existence of a financial leasing arrangement.

Participants agreed that arrangements similar to financial leases should be recorded as if a change of ownership of the relevant asset had taken place. In this context, it was pointed out that enterprises may not always report in the capital account the contra-entries to the entries in the merchandise account that cover the imputed change of ownership.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Recognizing the growth in financial lease transactions, both in the domestic and in the international contexts, participants expressed the view that an international standard for distinguishing between financial and operational leases is needed. Participants generally were looking for guidance from the International Accounting Standards Committee and suggested that the definition used for balance of payments statistics should be the same as that for national accounts statistics.

(2) Participants considered that until such guidance was forthcoming, the 75 percent cut-off referred to in the Manual should continue to apply in distinguishing between financial and operational leases for international transactions.

(3) Participants, furthermore, agreed that arrangements similar to financial leases should be brought under the ambit for financial leases.

3. Classification of services

a. Summary of discussions

In view of the large and rapidly growing international transactions in services, Fund staff had drafted a list of standard components of services covering components that could be used not only by compilers of balance of payments and national accounts statistics, but also by policy makers, in particular by the GATT Group on Negotiation of Services. The list, detailed in discussion paper BOP IIc, included components for services that are needed to preserve several traditional balance of payments items shown under services, to preserve the internal consistency of the national accounts, as well as to present new items that are becoming increasingly important as international transactions, such as financial services and communications. The list, furthermore, was to be consistent with the forthcoming Central Product Classification (CPC), at a high level of that hierarchy.

As the list was cast in the framework of the CPC, rather than in the framework of the list of standard components of the fourth edition of the Manual, it did not include two of the long-standing standard balance of payments components, i.e., "travel" and "other official goods, services, and income."

Most participants felt that the level of detail called for by the Fund's proposal was acceptable. All participants preferred, however, to retain separate entries for travel and government transactions n.i.e. In addition, participants recommended that some of the details called for by the two-digit level of the CPC should be omitted and that other details, some of which are called for by the four-digit level of that classification, should be added to the list of standard components for balance of payments purposes. Furthermore, suggestions were made concerning the coverage of the main headings and the separate identification of certain items, possibly as subdivisions of the main headings. Harmonization of the list of standard items of services for balance of payments purposes with a corresponding list for national accounts purposes was considered to be important.

In that connection, some participants pointed out that the CPC is geared to domestic rather than to international transactions and that balance of payments compilers, especially those who derive information from an exchange record, could not be expected to collect statistics that are not of interest from an international point of view.

A proposal made by one of the participants to develop a two-tier list of services transactions, i.e., a short list to be used by all compilers and a more detailed list to be used by compilers in statistically more-developed countries, found little support. Similarly, a proposal to distinguish, within each of the items, transactions between affiliated enterprises from transactions between enterprises that are not affiliated was not favored. It was felt that data on transactions between affiliated enterprises would not be sufficiently reliable in terms of the individual categories of service transactions to warrant the effort.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Participants noted the need for an expansion of the list of standard items as it appears in the Manual. In general, the proposed classification of services prepared by the Fund for the consideration of participants was judged to be adequate in terms of the number of broad headings identified, although more disaggregated data may be needed for other purposes. However, in order to reach agreement on a revised list, the need to achieve harmonization between the Manual and the SNA in the framework of the proposed Central Product Classification (CPC) was underscored.

(2) Participants emphasized the importance of continuity, as much as possible, with the list of standard components in the fourth edition of the Manual. In particular, they emphasized the need for the retention of separate items for travel and government transactions.

(3) A number of suggestions were made by participants concerning the separate identification and coverage of certain items, possibly as subdivisions of the main headings. Among them were suggestions for the separate identification of processing activities, telecommunications, data-bank services, business and management services, education and health services, motion picture rentals, and radio and television services. At the same time, the list prepared by the Fund could benefit from the consolidation of certain items, e.g., maintenance and repair services of motor vehicles, motorcycles and snowmobiles, repair services of personal and household goods, and real estate services, with other services.

(4) In considering changes to the Fund's proposed list of standard items, attention was drawn to the fact that the CPC was not yet finalized. As work on the finalization of the CPC was drawing to a close, it was suggested that balance of payments compilers should make known their special concerns relating to the classification of international transactions in services, such as technical services.

(5) Participants emphasized that the Fund and other interested agencies, i.e., the United Nations, the OECD, and the European Communities, coordinate their efforts in order to achieve a harmonized classification of international transactions in services.

(6) A revised classification should, as much as possible, take into account the present structure of the main international exchanges of services and their likely future direction.

4. The classification of income

a. Summary of discussions

Entries for income appear in the current account of the balance of payments in five places - as direct investment income; as other investment income; as a subcomponent of other official goods, services, and income, reflecting the compensation of employees; as a subcomponent of the labor income, n.i.e., component of other private goods, services, and income, reflecting the compensation of border workers and seasonal workers; and as the property income, n.i.e., component of other private goods, services, and income, reflecting the income on land and nonfinancial intangible assets.

Reflecting the requirements of harmonization of the Manual with the SNA, the proposed classification in discussion paper BOP IId separated income items from other flows. In addition, the proposed classification of income was intended to reflect (1) the proposed classification of capital account transactions, in the sense that the classification of income flows is parallel to that proposed for capital account transactions, and (2) the change in the coverage of reinvested earnings of direct investment enterprises to exclude that component of branch profits that cannot be identified as having been remitted.

Participants recognized that it would be analytically useful for the classification of the income account to be parallel to that of the capital account. However, the proposed classification was viewed as too detailed.

Thus, they suggested that rent on land should be merged with income from nonfinancial intangibles to form the item other property income. On the other hand, factor income should be decomposed into compensation of employees and investment income, while the latter should be further divided into direct investment income and other investment income, as suggested in the discussion paper BOP IId.

With respect to the further breakdown of the other investment income item, some participants considered that a sectoral breakdown should come after the breakdown by instrument; the distinction between interest and other investment income was considered to be analytically more meaningful than a breakdown by sector.

While it was generally conceded that data on interest payments and receipts related to reserves and liabilities constituting foreign authorities' reserves could not be made available, views regarding the availability of data on interest payments and receipts by foreign sector were less strong. In that connection, there was a suggestion that such information could be included in supplementary tables.

Participants held firm views regarding the breakdown of direct investment income. It was recommended, first, to make a clear distinction between interest and other investment income and, second, to distinguish within the latter category between remitted and reinvested earnings on equity investments. For this purpose, branch profits should be recorded in conformity with the Manual, i.e., recording under reinvested earnings the unremitted earnings of branches and other unincorporated direct investment enterprises, which should be shown separately, so that the information would be available for the purpose of making global adjustments to the income data.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Noting the conclusions of the Expert Group on External Sector Transactions, participants agreed on the need for separate identification of data on income flows in the balance of payments.

(2) Participants observed that the amount of detail in the proposed classification was somewhat excessive. Suggestions were made for the consolidation of some items and for the reorganization of the overall presentation.

(3) The following reordering of the categories of income was proposed: (a) compensation of employees; (b) investment income; and (c) other property income.

(4) A two-way breakdown of investment income, into direct investment income and other investment income, was proposed. Within the category of direct investment income, a further breakdown into remitted earnings, unremitted earnings, and interest was agreed by participants.

(5) For other investment income, an institutional breakdown (general government, monetary authorities, banking institutions, and other sectors) showing interest and other income, was seen by most participants as an acceptable presentation.

5. The classification of unrequited transfers

a. Summary of discussions

Unlike the SNA, the Manual does not call for separate data on unrequited current and capital transfers. In an effort to harmonize the Manual with the SNA classification, the proposed classification by the Fund staff in discussion paper BOP IIe contained that distinction as well as the text of the definitions of current and capital transfers used by other international organizations. Pending a review of these definitions, the discussion paper, however, did not provide a proposal for a definition of either unrequited current or capital transfers.

In other respects, the proposed classification followed more or less the classification given in the fourth edition of the Manual, the modifications reflecting mainly the recommendations of the Working

Party on the Statistical Discrepancy in World Current Account Balances. Specifically, the proposed classification highlighted transfers from or to the general government of the compiling economy, rather than interofficial transfers and other transfers from or to the general government or the central bank of a foreign economy.

Participants agreed that harmonization with the SNA was important. However, they expressed reservations on the guidelines for distinguishing between current and capital transfers given in the SNA and the European System of Accounts (ESA). It was suggested that difficulties arose in part from the fact that the guidelines were not necessarily always relevant for balance of payments purposes. While most participants were prepared to adopt an updated SNA distinction for balance of payments purposes, some could not see the need for making such a distinction.

There were also notable differences of view as to whether capital transfers should be included in the current or in the capital account of the balance of payments. In this respect, it was observed by one participant that symmetry of recording between donor and recipient countries may not be achievable.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Participants noted the conclusion of the Expert Group on External Sector Transactions that, in the context of the harmonization of the Manual and the SNA, a distinction between current and capital transfers should be made in the Manual.

(2) The present guidelines in the SNA and the European System of Accounts (ESA) were considered by participants to be insufficiently developed in a balance of payments context.

(3) While a number of participants acknowledged that, for balance of payments purposes, current and capital transfers would be separately identified, a further development of the SNA guidelines, including some examples, was seen as a prerequisite for making such a distinction.

6. Classification of capital account transactions

a. Summary of discussions

The discussion paper on this topic (BOP IIf) put forth a proposal for modifying the structure and classification of capital account transactions in the balance of payments. That proposal, in seeking to address the Fund's analytical and operational needs, was designed to facilitate links between data on transactions in financial assets and data on stocks of financial assets and the associated income flows. The proposal, furthermore, reflected the work on the harmonization of the Manual with the SNA and the Fund's statistical systems in the fields of government finance, and money and banking.

In the Fund's proposed presentation, the capital account covered transactions in financial assets and in nonfinancial intangibles, as well as certain specific changes in the stock of reserves, together with their counterparts. Most participants acknowledged the difficulties of distinguishing payments made for the use of nonfinancial intangibles from payments for the acquisition of such assets. As the present SNA called for such a distinction, several participants were prepared to accept a recommendation that the acquisition of nonfinancial intangibles should be recorded in the capital account. In the revision of the SNA, however, they preferred that consideration be given to including the acquisition of these intangibles with the use of such assets, i.e., in the current account.

In terms of transactions, the following categories were identified in the Fund's proposal: reserves, direct investment, and other capital, the latter including the existing category for portfolio investment. Other than for liabilities under long-terms loans, there was no longer a distinction between long-term and short-term capital.

Most participants agreed that the distinction between short-term and long-term capital flows had lost much of its analytical usefulness, although some considered that it continued to be important for debtor countries, in particular, for instruments with a stated maturity. Where it remained relevant, views were divided as to whether the distinction should be based on the residual or on the original maturity of the instrument. A proposal considered by participants to change the guideline determining the dividing line between short-term and long-term capital, from one year or more to more than one year, was not supported.

In addition to the distinction drawn between assets and liabilities, the proposed presentation put forward a sectorization of the item other capital into general government, monetary authorities, banking institutions, and a residual category; supplementary details were proposed for capital flows of banks, distinguishing the foreign party to the transaction. For reserves, it identified the total change in holdings, together with the counterpart to changes in holdings that are not attributable to transactions.

With regard to direct investment, the discussion paper suggested that consideration be given to defining this item in accordance with the OECD Benchmark Definition 1/ and that both inflows and outflows of direct investment be broken down into equity capital, reinvested earnings, and other flows.

For the recording of direct investment capital, the suggestion that flows of assets and liabilities should be recorded separately was supported by a few participants but others preferred to retain the present

1/ The Detailed Benchmark Definition of Foreign Direct Investment, OECD, Paris, 1983.

net assets and net liabilities basis of recording in the balance of payments standard presentation. Similarly, participants did not reach agreement on the usefulness of recording capital inflows net of capital outflows. Nor did they agree on the question of whether capital flows (1) between affiliated banks, (2) between affiliated financial institutions other than banks, and (3) between affiliated banks and nonbanks should be recorded under direct investment or under other capital.

For the purpose of the sectorization of capital other than reserves and direct investment, the discussion paper noted that sectorization would facilitate links with related bodies of statistics and flow of funds analysis, although it represented a slight departure from the institutional approach used in the SNA. The paper noted that general government would exclude deposit taking, as well as certain monetary authority functions, and that banking institutions would encompass deposit money banks and bank-like institutions, i.e., deposit banks as defined for the Fund's international banking statistics. Participants agreed that harmonization with the SNA in respect of sectorization was important and considered that the differences in approach should be eliminated, if possible, in the revision of the SNA.

As to the classification by financial instrument and the supplementary information on exceptional financing, the paper noted that both approaches were designed to provide the building blocks to be used in a variety of analytical applications.

Noting that the Expert Group on Financial Flows and Balance Sheets 1/ will examine the definitions of financial instruments, participants made some suggestions for consideration by that Group. Firstly, they considered that trade credits should include prepayments and should cover credits on transactions in both merchandise and services. Second, as a minimum, equities should be distinguished from all other instruments. Finally, they noted the difficulties that were likely to emerge in collecting data on transactions in securities by institutional sector.

The recommendations on the treatment of debt arrears, reschedulings, etc. given in the fourth edition of the Manual were considered adequate by participants. It was noted, however, that national compilers may find it difficult to follow these suggestions, as individual transactors may report on the basis of instructions set forth by regulatory authorities.

1/ The Expert Group on Financial Flows and Balance Sheets for the Revision of A System of National Accounts (SNA) is scheduled to meet under the Fund's auspices in Wahsington, D.C. late in 1988. The meeting will be part of the series of meetings organized by the Intersecretariat Group for the revision of the United Nations' SNA (comprising the Fund, the EEC, the OECD, the United Nations, and the World Bank).

Participants strongly recommended that the capital account of the balance of payments should cover only transactions. Although changes in balance sheet data arising other than from transactions, such as valuation changes in reserves and monetization/demonetization of gold, might be analytically useful, they should not be recorded in a balance of payment statement, but rather in a reconciliation statement. Participants, furthermore, recommended that the classification of the capital account should be somewhat limited in its detail, with analytically useful information presented, if necessary, as supplementary information in detailed tables. The supplementary information on balance of payments financing transactions other than the use of reserves, as described in discussion paper BOP IIf, was broadly acceptable to participants, although one participant emphasized that the criterion for distinguishing such financing from other financing should be clearly specified. In that connection, it was suggested that any domestic foreign currency borrowing might be classified as being for the purpose of balance of payments financing.

Finally, participants agreed that the presentation of the capital account in accordance with the *Manual* should be harmonized with that in the updated *SNA*, although harmonization should not override data availability. Most agreed with the classification of the domestic sectors as proposed in Appendix I of the discussion paper, but rejected any breakdown by foreign sector. A broad, rather than a narrow definition of banking institutions was peferred by some participants.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Participants noted that in any revision of the classification and sectorization of capital account transactions, harmonization with the revised *SNA* was important. In this regard, it was acknowledged that the *SNA* in this area was itself in need of updating. It was also noted that the classification proposed by the Fund in *The Classification of Capital Account Transactions* (Document BOP IIf) takes into account the need to promote compatibility with the Fund's related statistical systems on government finance and on money and banking.

(2) Participants expressed the need to establish a standard for compiling a full set of international accounts, covering balance of payments flows, international investment positions, and reconciliation accounts.

(3) Most participants considered that measurement of the balance of payments should be confined to transactions. However, there was support for the view that certain other data considered to be analytically useful could be presented as supplementary details.

(4) Although reservations were expressed with regard to some specific items suggested by the Fund, the classification was broadly acceptable to most participants as a basis for future work. It was noted that the provision of data on liabilities constituting foreign

authorities' reserves, especially for marketable securities, would be particularly difficult. In addition, difficulties were seen in the compilation of data on the foreign sector breakdown of transactions of banks. Some participants also considered that the sector breakdown might be difficult to apply in the case of marketable securities.

(5) Participants recognized the usefulness of information on direct investment flows on a gross basis, that is, separate information for assets and liabilities. However, a number of participants considered that in the standard presentation of the balance of payments direct investment should be shown on a net basis, as in the 4th edition of the Manual.

(6) Most participants considered that, in general, the distinction between long-term and short-term capital flows had lost much of its analytical significance. However, they saw some advantage in retaining the distinction for some purposes. Views were divided on the question of whether the original maturity, or the residual maturity, should be the basis for such a distinction. Many participants stressed the importance of information on the maturity breakdown of outstanding external debt. The need for a review of the application of the short-term/long-term distinction in respect of direct investment by banks was also noted by some participants.

(7) Participants recognized that the impact of the evolution of banking activity, new financial instruments, and their associated transactions would need to be addressed by experts in other groups.

7. International organizations

a. Summary of discussions

Both the Manual and the SNA treat international organizations as entities that are outside any national economy. The Expert Group on External Sector Transactions recommended a continuation of that treatment, with proposals as to the criteria that should enter into a revised definition 1/ of such organizations, and suggested that a list of such organizations be drawn up.

Participants encouraged the Fund to prepare and circulate to member countries an agreed list of organizations that in the view of the Fund should be treated as international organizations. The list

1/ The definition is based on three considerations. First, that the international organization must have authority derived directly from the authority of its members, which may be independent states or international organizations. Second, that it must have a sovereign status, i.e., the laws and regulations of the country or countries in which it is located do not apply to the international organization. Third, that the services it produces are primarily nonmarket services.

should be based on the definition of international organizations adopted by the Expert Group on External Sector Transactions, on the understanding that the third consideration of that definition refers to international organizations that typically produce nonmarket services. The list should contain organizations that are significant and should not be exhaustive.

In this respect, it was noted that the main purpose of such a list is to obtain, in a global context, contra-entries to the entries made in individual countries' balance of payments statements.

b. Summary of conclusions

(1) Participants recommended that an agreed list of international organizations be established in order to reduce the discrepancy in world current account balances resulting from the transactions of those organizations. Participants, furthermore, recommended that the Fund compile and distribute such a list.

(2) Participants agreed that such a list should cover only organizations that had some significance in a global context and/or in the context of an individual country's balance of payments.

(3) While otherwise accepting the definition of international organizations agreed to by the Expert Group on External Sector Transactions, participants recommended that the third component of that definition should be amended to refer to those organizations that "typically," rather than "primarily," produce nonmarket services.

Meeting of Balance of Payments Compilers
Paris, November 16-20, 1987

List of Participants

Representatives of Fund Member Countries

Mr. AL KHAMEES	Statistic Researcher, Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency
Mr. M.T. AMOAKO-ATTA	Chief, Research Department, Bank of Ghana
Mr. Jack BAME	Assoc. Dir. for International Economics Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce
Mr. B.J. BUCKINGHAM	Chief Statistician, Balance of Payments Div., Central Statistical Office, United Kingdom
Mr. Jorge CARRILES	Deputy Manager, Balance of Payments Div., Bank of Mexico
Mr. Jean COURTY	Deputy Manager, Balance of Payments Div., Bank of France
Mr. P. DAMASKOPOULOS	Head, Balance of Payments Div., Bank of Greece
Mrs. M.P. de CARTAGENA	Manager, Exchange Studies, Central Bank of Ecuador
Ms. Barbara DUNLOP	Assistant Statistician, International Accounts Branch, Australian Bureau of Statistics
Mr. A.M. EL-NAIEM	Dir. Gen., Econ. Res. and Stat. Dept., Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency
Mr. Erling J. FLØTTUM	Deputy Director, Central Bureau of Stat., Norway
Mrs. Carlene FRANCIS	Head, Research Department, Central Bank of the Bahamas
Mr. Hisatsugu FURUKAWA	Manager, Balance of Payments Division Foreign Dept., Bank of Japan
Mr. M. Haider GHULOUM	Deputy Head, Technical Office Central Bank of Kuwait
Mr. K.R. HOLLA	Director, Div. of International Finance, Reserve Bank of India
Mr. P.P. KALLAA	Deputy Director of Statistics, Cent. Bureau of Stat., Kenya
Mrs. Lucie LALIBERTE	Asst. Dir., Int. & Fin. Econ. Div., Statistics Canada
Mr. Philippe LEGRIS	Deputy Manager, Balance of Payments Div., Bank of France
Mr. LIN See-Yan	Deputy Governor, Central Bank of Malaysia
Mr. Raymond PRIOUX	Advisor to the Governor, BEAC Yaoundé

Mr. Robert REYNDERS	Senior Economist, Balance of Payments Div., National Bank of Belgium
Mr. Jorge RODRIGUEZ	Deputy Manager, Office of Res. & Stat. of the Ext. Sector, Central Bank of Argentina
Mr. Kurt SENFF	Director, Balance of Payments Div., Deutsche Bundesbank, Germany
Mr. Marius VAN NIEUWKERK	Chief, Balance of Payments Div., Bank of the Netherlands
Ms. Jingping YANG	Economist, The People's Bank of China

OECD

Mr. Peter HILL	Chief, Economic Statistics & National Accounts Division, Economics and Statistics Department
Mr. Erwin VEIL	Economics and Statistics Department
Mrs. Madeleine ESMENARD	Economics and Statistics Department

EEC

Mr. Raymond SALVAT	Chief, Balance of Payments Division, Eurostat
Mr. Jean-Claude ROMAN	Balance of Payments Division, Eurostat

IMF

Mr. John B. McLENAGHAN	Deputy Director, Bureau of Statistics
Mr. Arie C. BOUTER	Consultant, Bureau of Statistics
Mr. Mahinder S. GILL	Chief, Balance of Payments Division, Bureau of Statistics

List of Discussion Papers

Review of Findings of the Working Party on the World Current Account Discrepancy (BOP I)

The residence of enterprises: issues related to enterprises engaged in production in international waters or air space, and enterprises temporarily engaged in production abroad (BOP IIa)

The recording of financial and operational leases and of arrangements similar to financial leases (BOP IIb)

The classification of services (BOP IIc)

The classification of income (BOP IId)

The classification of unrequited transfers (BOP IIe)

The classification of capital account transactions (BOP IIf)

International organizations (BOP IIg)

List of Background Papers

Final Report of the Working Party on the Statistical Discrepancy in World Current Account Balances, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., September 1987 (BOP.B1)

Detailed Benchmark Definition of Foreign Direct Investment, OECD, Paris, January 1983 (BOP.B2)

Report of the Meeting of the Expert Group Meeting on External Sector Transactions for the Revision of the SNA, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., July 1987 (BOP.B3)

Some Issues in the Balance of Payments Presentation of Arrears and Debt Reorganization, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., December 1986 (BOP.B4)

Balance of Payments Manual, Fourth edition, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., 1977 (BOP.B5)

Standard Balance of Payments Questionnaire for Enterprises, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D.C., July 1983 (BOP.B6)

Standardising Member Countries' Balance of Payments Statistics on Trade in Services, OECD, Paris, June 1987 (BOP.B7)

Replies to the Questionnaire (TD/87.3/6) on the OECD Note "Standardising Member Countries' Balance of Payments Statistics on Trade in Services" [TC/WP(87)17(1st Revision)], OECD, Paris, November 1987 (BOP.B8)

Problems Concerning Rules Application on the 4th Manual into the BEAC Area, BEAC, Yaoundé, November 1987 (BOP.B9)

Classification Exchange of Invisibles, European Communities, Luxembourg, October 1987 (BOP.B10)

Renegotiation (Forgiveness) of Interest on Foreign Debt: Proposed Balance of Payments Treatment, Bank of Mexico, Mexico, November 1987 (BOP.B11)

Note on New Financial Instrument Named Gold Investment Account in Japan, Bank of Japan, Tokyo, November 1987 (BOP.B12)