

Questionnaire for The Holistic Review of *BPM6* Update Priorities

Purpose of the Survey

The purpose of this survey is to receive inputs on the costs and benefits of introducing new data breakdowns in connection with the update of the sixth edition of the *Balance of Payments and International Investment Position Manual (BPM6)*. If you are a user of external sector statistics, you are being asked to assess the benefits of implementing new data breakdowns. If you are a compiler, you are being asked to assess the costs and optionally—if you are also a data user—the benefits.

The [update of BPM6](#) has been underway since March 2020 and has benefitted from extensive participation by experts from national agencies and international organizations, including from other macroeconomic statistical domains. Specialized Task Teams have produced Guidance Notes with specific recommendations, which have been subject to global consultation and discussions within the [IMF Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics \(the Committee\)](#) as well as the [Advisory Expert Group on National Accounts](#) (AEG) when the topics also have implications for the update of the *System of National Accounts (SNA)*.

This survey covers new breakdowns that are proposed to be part of *BPM7* as either standard or supplementary items. Standard items consist of standard components and memorandum items. Standard components are items that are fully part of the framework and contribute to the totals and balancing items. Memorandum items are part of the standard presentation but are not used in deriving totals and balancing items. Supplementary items are outside the standard presentation, which may be compiled depending on circumstances in the particular economy, taking into account the interests of policymakers and analysts as well as resource costs.

The outcomes of this survey will guide the IMF—advised by the Committee—to take final decisions on the changes to be introduced in the forthcoming *BPM7*.

Instructions

For each question, please provide the answer by checking the relevant check box(es) or by typing in the framed textboxes, which will automatically expand to fit the text. You will be asked to assess the costs and/or benefits of introducing new data breakdowns on a scale from 0 (no costs/benefits) to 5 (very high costs/benefits). If a certain breakdown is outside your domain, or you do not want to respond, please check the N/A box.

For compilers of external sector statistics (ESS), we recommend providing coordinated answers between the national agencies responsible for the compilation of ESS (for example, the central bank and the national statistics office), if possible. For ESS users, we would appreciate one coordinated response per institution.

Please note that this questionnaire may reach one or more contacts in your institution; however, only one response is expected. A printable version of the questionnaire is available for your convenience. If you have any questions, please contact STABPM6Update@imf.org.

We look forward to and highly appreciate your collaboration.

Sincerely,

*Balance of Payments Division
IMF Statistics Department*

1. Please provide your information below:

Country _____
Institution/Organization _____
Name _____
Position/Title _____
Email _____

2. How would you describe your role in external sector statistics? *¹

- ☐ Compiler
- ☐ User
- ☐ Both compiler and user

[Compilers will only be asked about costs of implementing recommendations, users will only be asked about benefits, while respondents who are both compilers and users will be asked about both costs and benefits.]

3. What kind of institution do you represent?

- ☐ Central bank
- ☐ National statistics office
- ☐ Central bank/national statistics office (for joint responses from compilers)
- ☐ Other public sector institution
- ☐ International organization
- ☐ Academia/research institution
- ☐ Private sector institution
- ☐ Other, please specify: _____

4. Which areas of external sector statistics are you involved in (please check all that apply)? *

- ☐ Current account
- ☐ Direct investment
- ☐ Financial and payments systems
- ☐ General principles, structural and cross-cutting issues
- ☐ Globalization

[Respondents will only be asked to answer questions within the area(s) that they are involved in.]

¹ * means that a response is required.

Current Account

Guidance Note C.1: Recording of Transactor-Based Components of Service (Travel, Construction, and Government Goods and Services Not Included Elsewhere) in the Balance of Payments

The classification of some services in the *Balance of Payments and International Investment Position Manual, sixth edition (BPM6)* differs from the classification in the *2008 System of National Accounts (2008 SNA)* and the *Central Product Classification*. Specifically, *BPM6* classifies travel, construction, and government goods and services not included elsewhere on a transactor basis (i.e., based on the provider/acquirer rather than the product itself). To support analysis of the consistency between trade data and supply and use tables, this Guidance Note recommends maintaining the transactor-based approach while (i) adding to the **supplementary** reporting under travel in the *BPM6* paragraph 10.95 to include personal, cultural, and recreation services (acquired by travelers) as a distinct item under the other services category; and (ii) introducing **supplementary** reporting under construction services for (a) constructions (e.g., buildings) and (b) construction services.

5a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Supplementary data | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Personal, cultural, and recreation services (acquired by travelers) | | | | | | | |
| Constructions | | | | | | | |
| Construction services | | | | | | | |

5b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Supplementary data | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|--|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Personal, cultural, and recreation services (acquired by travelers) | | | | | | | |
| Constructions | | | | | | | |
| Construction services | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note C.2: Goods, Services, and Investment Income Accounts by Enterprise Characteristics

This Guidance Note recommends the inclusion of **supplementary** data on enterprise characteristics as part of the annual reporting of the current account. Specifically, the Guidance Note recommends annual breakdowns of the goods, services, and investment income accounts by the characteristics of the resident party to the transaction, such as industry, ownership (domestically controlled vs. controlled from abroad/unknown), and firm size (based on employment), to enhance the relevance of the current account for the analysis of globalization.

6a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Current account component | Breakdown by: | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----|
| Goods trade | Industry | | | | | | | |
| | Ownership | | | | | | | |
| | Firm size | | | | | | | |
| Services trade | Industry | | | | | | | |
| | Firm size | | | | | | | |
| | Ownership | | | | | | | |
| Investment income | Industry | | | | | | | |
| | Firm size | | | | | | | |
| | Ownership | | | | | | | |

6b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Current account component | Breakdown by: | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Goods trade | Industry | | | | | | | |
| | Ownership | | | | | | | |
| | Firm size | | | | | | | |
| Services trade | Industry | | | | | | | |
| | Firm size | | | | | | | |
| | Ownership | | | | | | | |
| Investment income | Industry | | | | | | | |
| | Firm size | | | | | | | |
| | Ownership | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note C.3: International Trade Classified by Currency (Including for Trade Linked to Long-term Trade Credits and Advances)

This Guidance Note recognizes the analytical value of the currency composition of international trade and recommends the following:

Recommendation 1 (goods): An annual, **supplementary** (i.e., compiled depending on circumstances in the particular economy) disaggregation of international trade in goods (gross totals of the imports and exports) by the currency of denomination.

Recommendation 2 (services): An annual, **supplementary** disaggregation of international trade in services (gross totals of the imports and exports) by the currency of denomination.

7a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (goods broken down by currency) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (services broken down by currency) | | | | | | | |

7b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|--------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (goods broken down by currency) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (services broken down by currency) | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note C.4: Merchanting and Factoryless Producers; Clarifying Negative Exports in Merchanting; and Merchanting of Services

This Guidance Note focuses on disentangling the transactions related to global manufacturing arrangements and factoryless goods producers (FGPs—i.e., producers that outsource the manufacturing transformation activities but own the underlying intellectual property products and control the outcome of the production process), as well as merchanting of services. Among other things, the Guidance Note recommends the addition of a **supplementary** item under *General Merchandise* covering goods traded within a global manufacturing arrangement and **supplementary** items under *Net exports of goods* under *Merchanting* covering the material inputs procured by the principal in a global manufacturing arrangement from third parties and sold to the contractor.

8a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above?
(Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Adding supplementary item under <i>General Merchandise</i> to identify trade in goods within a global manufacturing arrangement | | | | | | | |
| Adding supplementary item under <i>Net exports of goods</i> under <i>Merchanting</i> to identify material inputs procured by the principal in a global manufacturing arrangement from third parties and sold to the contractor | | | | | | | |

8b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above?
(Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Adding supplementary item under <i>General Merchandise</i> to identify trade in goods within a global manufacturing arrangement | | | | | | | |
| Adding supplementary item under <i>Net exports of goods</i> under <i>Merchanting</i> to identify material inputs procured by the principal in a global manufacturing arrangement from third parties and sold to the contractor | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note C.6: Trade in Services Classifications

Many countries are unable to compile the full *BPM6* classification on international trade in services, and some only produce the first-level breakdown (in other words, the twelve major services categories without additional breakdowns). This limits the usefulness of existing international trade in services statistics for analysis and policymaking. Therefore, this Guidance Note recommends the following:

Recommendation 1 (*telecommunications, computer, and information services*): Split *Telecommunications, computer, and information services* into two **standard**, first-level items: (i) *Telecommunication services* and (ii) *Computer and information services*.

Recommendation 2 (*other business services*): Split *Other business services* into five **standard**, first-level items: (i) *Research and development services*; (ii) *Professional and management consulting services*; (iii) *Trade-related services*; (iv) *Operating leasing services*; and (v) *Technical and other business services*.

9a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above?
(Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (Split <i>Telecommunications, computer, and information services</i>) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (Split <i>Other business services</i>) | | | | | | | |

9b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above?
(Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (Split <i>Telecommunications, computer, and information services</i>) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (Split <i>Other business services</i>) | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note C.7: Treatment of Travel Packages, Health-Related Travel, and Taxes and Fees on Passengers' Tickets

This Guidance Note recommends, among other things, recording travel packages as a separate **supplementary** line in *BPM7*.

10a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendation (recording travel packages as a separate supplementary line) described above?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

10b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendation (recording travel packages as a separate supplementary line) described above?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

11. Please feel free to elaborate on your responses related to the current account (optional):

Direct Investment

Guidance Note D.1: Greenfield Investment and Extension of Capacity

This Guidance Note recommends including guidance on the definition and collection of data on greenfield investment and extension of capacity. *Definition:* A broader definition of greenfield direct investment (DI) is proposed: greenfield DI is both investment in new direct investment enterprises (DIEs) (narrow definition) and new capital injections/extension of capacity (broader definition) into existing DIEs.

Collection of Data: Compilers would be encouraged to collect information on inward greenfield investments and extension of capacity as part of DI transactions. This will be as a **supplementary** series under DI and compiled using “the transactions approach,” i.e., breaking down DI transactions by their type (M&As; greenfield investment; extension of capacity; and a residual category that includes financial restructuring). Countries should collect these data for both equity and debt instruments, and exclude the “pass-through” funds, if possible. The recording should be on net inward DI. Greenfield investment and extension of capacity statistics should ideally collect breakdowns by industry of the DIE as well as geographical breakdown of the (ultimate) investor to deepen our understanding of these investments. Compilers should also provide additional information on reinvested earnings (RIE), i.e., the net income of direct investment enterprises that has not been distributed to direct investors in the form of dividends, if possible.

12a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with compiling supplementary statistics on greenfield DI transactions as described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Supplementary statistics on greenfield DI transactions | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Total net inward DI | | | | | | | |
| Excluding pass-through funds | | | | | | | |
| Additional information on reinvested earnings | | | | | | | |
| Economy of immediate investor | | | | | | | |
| Economy of ultimate investor | | | | | | | |

12b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with supplementary statistics on greenfield DI transactions as described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Supplementary statistics on greenfield DI transactions | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Total net inward DI | | | | | | | |
| Excluding pass-through funds | | | | | | | |
| Additional information on reinvested earnings | | | | | | | |
| Economy of immediate investor | | | | | | | |
| Economy of ultimate investor | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note D.4: Corporate Inversions

This Guidance Note recommends including in *BPM7* (i) a taxonomy of the most usual cases of corporate actions that involve inversions as well as other forms of restructuring with similar economic effects; (ii) the official definition of corporate inversion as: “A corporate inversion describes the corporate restructuring of a transnational enterprise group such that the original parent company in one economy that is the ultimate parent of the corporate group becomes a subsidiary of the new parent in another economy. In addition, ownership of a group of enterprises may be shifted to the new parent company”; and (iii) strengthening the current guidance on compiling **supplementary** statistics covering transactions, positions and income of corporate inversions for economies where they are relevant.

13a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with providing supplementary statistics for corporate inversions?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

13b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with providing supplementary statistics for corporate inversions?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

Guidance Note D.6: Ultimate Investing Economy/Ultimate Host Economy and Pass-through Funds

Complex financing and ownership structures of multinational enterprises can mask ultimate ownership links and “inflate” DI transactions and positions as each flow into and out of each economy is counted even if the funds, or income, is just passing through. This Guidance Note recommends the following:

Recommendation 1 (*ultimate investing economy (UIE)*): (i) Define the UIE based on control of the group to align with the approach used for statistics on multinational enterprises (i.e., the “Winner Takes All”); and (ii) develop a **supplementary** presentation of DI statistics by UIE.

Recommendation 2 (*ultimate host economy (UHE)*): Develop a **supplementary** presentation of DI statistics that looks through special purpose entities (SPEs) to the first operating unit as a first step in presenting DI statistics by UHE.

Recommendation 3 (*pass-through funds*): (i) Streamline the definition of pass-through funds; and (ii) develop a **supplementary** presentation of DI statistics with identification of pass-through funds based on the residency of the ultimate investor.

14a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (supplementary presentation of DI statistics by UIE) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (supplementary presentation of DI statistics that looks through SPEs to the first operating unit) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 3 (supplementary presentation of DI statistics identifying pass-through funds) | | | | | | | |

14b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (supplementary presentation of DI statistics by UIE) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (supplementary presentation of DI statistics that looks through SPEs to the first operating unit) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 3 (supplementary presentation of DI statistics identifying pass-through funds) | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note D.7: Sectoral Breakdown of Direct Investment

DI is currently the only functional category, for which the financial instruments are not presented by resident institutional sector. This Guidance Note recommends implementing a sectoral breakdown of DI (central bank; deposit-taking corporations, except the central bank; general government; other financial corporations; nonfinancial corporations; households, and nonprofit institutions serving households) as part of the **standard** presentation in the balance of payments and the international investment position (IIP). This sectoral breakdown will be for both equity and debt instruments, and, for the total equity investment, this breakdown is applied to reinvestment of earnings as well. This change will be implemented maintaining the *BPM6* standard components used to derive the directional values within DI to support the reconciliation of DI statistics to directional principle as memorandum items.

15a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with incorporating a sectoral breakdown of DI?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

15b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with incorporating a sectoral breakdown of DI?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

Guidance Note D.12: Including Intra-Concern [Between Affiliates] Derivatives in Direct Investment

Currently, with the exception of financial derivatives associated with the official reserve asset management, all others are included in the separate functional category *financial derivatives* within the balance of payments and IIP. This Guidance Note recommends that intra-concern derivatives continue to be reported in the *financial derivatives* functional category but that a **supplementary** “of which: between affiliates” item be added so that intra-concern financial derivatives can be separately identified.

16a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with providing a supplementary “of which: between affiliates” item under *financial derivatives*?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

16b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with having a supplementary “of which: between affiliates” item under *financial derivatives*?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

17. Please feel free to elaborate on your responses related to direct investment (optional):

Financial and Payments Systems

Guidance Note F.1: More Disaggregated Institutional Sector and Financial Instrument Breakdowns

More disaggregated breakdowns of institutional sectors need to be considered to improve the analytical value of external sector statistics. This Guidance Note recommends splitting nonfinancial corporations, and households and nonprofit institutions serving households (NPISH) into two separate **standard** components. Currently, these institutional sectors are aggregated into one as a standard component in *BPM6*, which does not allow separating cross-border positions and flows of resident corporations from those of households and NPISHs.

18a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with splitting nonfinancial corporations, and households & NPISH?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

18b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with splitting nonfinancial corporations, and households & NPISH?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

Guidance Note F.2: Asymmetric Treatment of Retained Earnings

Retained earnings of direct investment (DI) enterprises are considered in the international statistical standards as being remitted to the direct investors and reinvested by them. The corresponding income flows are called “reinvested earnings” (RIE). The treatment of retained earnings as RIE is circumscribed to DI and does not extend to cross-border portfolio investment or to domestic equity relationships, which induces asymmetries in the reflection of corporate profits in official statistics and might be seen as giving rise to issues of interpretability and comparability of macroeconomic indicators. This Guidance Note concludes that while there might be a conceptual preference for the extension of RIE to all equity investments, there would be practical challenges. Therefore, this Guidance Note recommends keeping the core balance of payments accounts unchanged. The Guidance Note also recommends adding **supplementary** information on portfolio investment RIE.

19a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with providing supplementary information on portfolio investment RIE?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

19b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with receiving supplementary information on portfolio investment RIE?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

Guidance Note F.3: Reverse Transactions

This Guidance Note recommends that the *BPM7* discuss the usefulness of separate identification of repo-related transactions and positions and encourages economies engaged in reverse transactions to prepare **supplementary** information on such transactions (e.g., by type of assets under reverse transactions (cash, securities, or other) and the role of assets in reverse transactions (provided/lent vs. received/borrowed)).

20a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with providing supplementary information on reverse transactions by type of (lent/borrowed) assets?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

20b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with receiving supplementary information on reverse transactions by type of (lent/borrowed) assets?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

Guidance Note F.4: Financial Derivatives by Type

This Guidance Note recommends discontinuing the current breakdown of financial derivatives by broad type (i.e., options and forward-type contracts) in favor of more analytically useful classifications. The following classifications should be introduced: (a) by market risk category (foreign exchange; single-currency interest rate; equity; commodity; credit; others), (b) by instrument (options; forwards and related instruments; futures; swaps; credit derivatives; marketable employee stock options and other instruments), and (c) by trading venue (exchange traded; over the counter (cleared); over the counter (not cleared)). Classification (a) is a **standard** component while both (b) and (c) are **supplementary** items but to be listed in the list of standard components and selected supplementary items/presentation tables.

21a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Breakdown by: | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Market risk category (standard component) | | | | | | | |
| Instrument (supplementary) | | | | | | | |
| Trading venue (supplementary) | | | | | | | |

21b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Breakdown by: | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Market risk category (standard component) | | | | | | | |
| Instrument (supplementary) | | | | | | | |
| Trading venue (supplementary) | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note F.6: Capturing Non-Bank Financial Intermediation in the System of National Accounts and the External Sector Statistics

This Guidance Note recognizes the analytical value of collecting additional information on non-bank financial intermediation and recommends introducing further breakdowns of the subsector Other Financial Corporations (OFCs) as **supplementary** items to better capture non-bank financial intermediation. The OFC breakdown would include (i) money market funds (MMFs); (ii) non-MMF investment funds; (iii) insurance corporations; (iv) pension funds; (v) other financial intermediaries (of which: central clearing counterparties); and (vi) captive financial institutions and money lenders, and financial auxiliaries.

22a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with providing further supplementary breakdowns of OFCs as described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Money market funds (MMFs) | | | | | | | |
| Non-MMF investment funds | | | | | | | |
| Insurance corporations | | | | | | | |
| Pension funds | | | | | | | |
| Other financial intermediaries | | | | | | | |
| Other financial intermediaries (of which: central clearing counterparties) | | | | | | | |
| Captive financial institutions and money lenders, and financial auxiliaries | | | | | | | |

22b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with having further supplementary breakdowns of OFCs as described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| Money market funds (MMFs) | | | | | | | |
| Non-MMF investment funds | | | | | | | |
| Insurance corporations | | | | | | | |
| Pension funds | | | | | | | |
| Other financial intermediaries | | | | | | | |
| Other financial intermediaries (of which: central clearing counterparties) | | | | | | | |
| Captive financial institutions and money lenders, and financial auxiliaries | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note F.7: Impact of Fintech on Macroeconomic Statistics

This Guidance Note finds that existing international statistical standards allow for proper treatment and recording of fintech companies and fintech related activities (not only financial transactions but also provision of services) in most cases. Therefore, the Guidance Note recommends introducing a **supplementary** “of which” category for fintech companies within the subsector classification if a country has a strong need to separately identify them. Such an “of which” category may also be considered for instruments or services classifications where necessary (e.g., for central bank digital currencies or crypto assets, or financial services provided by fintech platforms) to separate out fintech-related instruments and services.

23a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above?
(Please check one box per row)

| Data | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|--|---|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Introduction of a supplementary “of which” category for fintech companies within the subsector classification | | | | | | | |
| Introduction of a supplementary “of which” category for instruments or services classifications where necessary to separate out fintech-related instruments and services | | | | | | | |

23b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row)

| Data | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Introduction of a supplementary “of which” category for fintech companies within the subsector classification | | | | | | | |
| Introduction of a supplementary “of which” category for instruments or services classifications where necessary to separate out fintech-related instruments and services | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note F.8: Valuation of Debt Securities at Both Market and Nominal Value

The valuation method for debt securities recommended in *BPM6* and the *2008 SNA* is market value. This Guidance Note recommends the inclusion of explicit guidance to compile stocks of debt securities at nominal value, as a supplement to the existing market valuation. It proposes to strengthen the recommendation to compile securities liabilities using both market and nominal values. It also recommends adopting a **supplementary** presentation table that provides a reconciliation between nominal and market valuation of debt securities liabilities. Finally, the Guidance Note recommends reporting debt securities used in direct investment inter-company lending as a supplementary item to the table.

24a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Nominal values | | | | | | | |
| Reconciliation table | | | | | | | |
| Direct investment inter-company lending (as supplement to the table) | | | | | | | |

24b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations described above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Nominal values | | | | | | | |
| Reconciliation table | | | | | | | |
| Direct investment inter-company lending (as supplement to the table) | | | | | | | |

25. Please feel free to elaborate on your responses related to financial and payments systems (optional):

General Principles, Structural and Cross-Cutting Issues

Guidance Note B.2: Standardized Statistical Definition of Net International Reserves

Net International Reserves (NIR) are available from several sources, but definitions and practices differ along several dimensions, including specificity and treatment of liabilities (on a maturity and residential basis), liabilities to the IMF, and Special Drawing Rights (SDR) allocations. This Guidance Note recommends the introduction of a standardized statistical definition of NIR based on the existing statistical frameworks in *BPM6* and the International Reserves and Foreign Currency Liquidity (IRFCL) Guidelines and recommends inclusion of the new definition in the respective updated versions. The recommended statistical definition provides a comprehensive approach aimed to inform reserve adequacy assessments and macroeconomic policy advice. Modifications for country-specific characteristics and vulnerabilities remain crucial for reserve adequacy assessments and in the design and monitoring of Fund-supported programs. The proposed statistical definition of NIR goes beyond the scope of the standard balance of payments framework, but it could be included in *BPM7* in an annex/box and be part of the IRFCL framework.

26a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with producing information on NIR according to the standardized statistical definition described above?

- ☐ 0 (no costs; already compile these data)
- ☐ 1 (very low costs)
- ☐ 2 (low costs)
- ☐ 3 (moderate costs)
- ☐ 4 (high costs)
- ☐ 5 (very high costs)
- ☐ N/A

26b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with having information on NIR according to the standardized statistical definition described above?

- ☐ 0 (no benefits)
- ☐ 1 (very low benefits)
- ☐ 2 (low benefits)
- ☐ 3 (moderate benefits)
- ☐ 4 (high benefits)
- ☐ 5 (very high benefits)
- ☐ N/A

Guidance Note B.4: Reconciliation Between Flows and Stocks

This Guidance Note recommends putting the integrated presentation of flows and positions at the center of *BPM7* by presenting the external statistics framework as being composed of three major intertwined elements: (i) the balance of payments, (ii) the international investment position (IIP), and (iii) the accumulation accounts, which explain changes in the IIP between two points in time with transactions from the balance of payments' financial account, revaluations, and other changes in volume. The integrated IIP statement would be included as a **standard** component in *BPM7*. Further, the "Other Changes in Volume" should be presented with a total, and with two **supplementary** "of which" categories—"Reclassifications" and "Debt Cancellation and Write-offs".

27a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Producing an integrated IIP statement as a standard component | | | | | | | |
| Breaking down "Other Changes in Volume" into two supplementary "of which" categories—"Reclassifications" and "Debt Cancellation and Write offs" | | | | | | | |

27b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Producing an integrated IIP statement as a standard component | | | | | | | |
| Breaking down "Other Changes in Volume" into two supplementary "of which" categories—"Reclassifications" and "Debt Cancellation and Write offs" | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note B.6: Sustainable Finance: Integrating Measures of Climate Change Risk into External Sector Statistics

This Guidance Note recommends including an updatable appendix in *BPM7* on measures and balance of payments/IIP indicators related to climate change-related financial risks. The appendix initially would include the following indicators:

Recommendation 1 (*direct investment breakdowns*): Include **supplementary** geographical and industrial sector breakdowns of direct investment.

Recommendation 2 (*green bonds*): Add a **supplementary** “of which” category to identify green bonds in the balance of payments/IIP.

28a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---|---|--------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (supplementary geographical and industrial sector breakdowns of direct investment) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (supplementary “of which” category to identify green bonds) | | | | | | | |

28b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (supplementary geographical and industrial sector breakdowns of direct investment) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (supplementary “of which” category to identify green bonds) | | | | | | | |

29. Please feel free to elaborate on your responses related to general principles, structural and cross-cutting issues (optional):

Globalization

Guidance Note G.4: Treatment of Special Purpose Entities and Residency

This Guidance Note recognizes the analytical value of compiling data on special purpose entities (SPEs) and recommends the following:

Recommendation 1 (*definition and sector breakdown*): Adopt an international definition of SPEs in both *BPM7* and the *2025 SNA*, aligned with the recent work of the IMF's Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics. The Guidance Note also recommends leaving the core framework unchanged and integrating the recommended breakdown of SPEs within the institutional sector accounts on a **supplementary** basis for countries for which SPEs are significant.

Recommendation 2 (*nationality basis*): Present nationality-based SPE statistics as a **supplement** to residency-based statistics for economies for which SPEs are deemed important. The nationality-based approach reflects a global consolidation of multinational enterprises (MNEs) such that the statistics are organized according to the location of the entity that ultimately controls the SPEs rather than by the residency of the SPEs, thus incorporating the dimension of ownership and control.

30a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|---|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (supplementary breakdown for SPEs) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (producing supplementary nationality-based SPE statistics) | | | | | | | |

30b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Recommendation | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendation 1 (supplementary breakdown for SPEs) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation 2 (producing supplementary nationality-based SPE statistics) | | | | | | | |

Guidance Note G.7: Global Value Chains and Trade in Value Added

This Guidance Note examines how production fragmentation has deepened the divergence between gross transactions, as recorded by traditional international trade statistics, and the data on production and final demand as accounted for in value added statistics. To better account for interlinked core production activities and supporting services activities, the Guidance Note recommends no changes to the core BPM and SNA concepts. Instead, the Guidance Note recommends including a description of global value chains (GVCs) and trade in value added in the updated manuals. Within the BPM, the Guidance Note recommends including **supplementary** cross-border statistics detailed by geography or product as part of a reporting template for GVC data collection.

31a. What is your assessment of the costs associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no costs; already compile these data) | 1 (very low costs) | 2 (low costs) | 3 (moderate costs) | 4 (high costs) | 5 (very high costs) | N/A |
|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|-----|
| Supplementary cross-border statistics detailed by <u>geography</u> | | | | | | | |
| Supplementary cross-border statistics detailed by <u>product</u> | | | | | | | |

31b. What is your assessment of the benefits associated with implementing the recommendations above? (Please check one box per row.)

| Data | 0 (no benefits) | 1 (very low benefits) | 2 (low benefits) | 3 (moderate benefits) | 4 (high benefits) | 5 (very high benefits) | N/A |
|--|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|-----|
| Supplementary cross-border statistics detailed by <u>geography</u> | | | | | | | |
| Supplementary cross-border statistics detailed by <u>product</u> | | | | | | | |

32. Please feel free to elaborate on your responses related to globalization (optional):
