

The distinction between deposits and loans in macro-economic statistics

SNA Update Issue 44a

BOPCOM Outcomes on Questions/Points for Discussion

I. Questions/points for discussion

1. *What are the views of Group members on the analytical use of the split between deposits and loans?*

The IMF Committee on Balance of Payments Statistics agreed that the distinction was useful.

2. *Should the usefulness of this split be confirmed, do Group members agree that current international standards do not provide clear criteria to perform such a distinction?*

The Committee noted that the distinction was blurred in a minority of cases. It was agreed that it was not necessary for the Committee to prescribe criteria.

3. *Do Group members have any preference for any of the criteria mentioned in the note, i.e. (i) looking at who takes the initiative (and whether or not a distinction should be made between short-term and long-term instruments); (ii) taking into account the nature of the borrower (banks \approx deposits / non-banks \approx loans); (iii) defining in a very precise way which instruments meet the definition of “transferable” and “other deposits”; (iv) considering the representation in the documents that evidence loans or deposits; etc.?*

The Committee mentioned the parties’ own descriptions, and the financial/nonfinancial borrower criterion. It was considered that the use of the party who initiates the arrangement was not an effective criterion.