

Report on the Outcome of the Global Consultation on the Draft 2025 SNA

Chapter 13: Other change in assets and liabilities accounts

38 comments were received from 15 respondents.

Question 1 – Have the agreed recommendations been reflected appropriately?

One substantive issues was raised.

Issue 13.1.1: In paragraph 13.20 and other relevant paragraphs, the criterion of control, responsibility and management has been reintroduced for the treatment of biological resources, rather than the distinction between migrating versus non-migrating biological resources yielding once-only products. Based on the feedback received in various consultation rounds, the latter distinction between migrating versus non-migrating – which was used as an easy interpretable elaboration of the resources being under the control, etc., or not, of institutional units – was indeed abandoned, because it didn't work in practice. In the current guidance, the criterion of control, responsibility and management has therefore been reintroduced, but using examples of migrating and non-migrating resources. One respondent argued that this is inconsistent with the consolidated list of recommendations.

Proposed response: When presenting the draft 2025 SNA to the UN Statistical Commission, one could add this issue to the accompanying cover-note. It is not clear, however, whether this is necessary. In view of being fully transparent, one could also mention this explicitly, together with the decisions on other issues related to the treatment of natural capital.

Three minor additional issues were raised which are considered relevant for inclusion:

- Paragraph 13.21: It is proposed to change the language, in order to make it more neutral, by avoiding making references to “sustainability”. Instead, one may change the wording to, for example, “levels of extraction being larger than levels of growth”. This may also have an impact on similar paragraphs in other chapters (e.g., chapter 11).
- Paragraph 13.35: The paragraph needs to be rewritten, to align it to the guidance provided in foot-note 53 of GN F.18, which basically states that the relevant crypto assets do not come into existence via an other change in volume, but by way of a financial transaction. The relevant foot-note states the following: “This is akin to when a company issues additional stock and the existing shareholders do not partake in the offering. As such, the initial holders knowingly are diluting the value of their existing CAWLM to benefit in the future. Note that under this approach the issuance of new CAWLM does not give rise to other changes in the volume of assets, but just to a financial transaction corresponding to the dilution in the value of the portfolio of the owners of existing CAWLM and the increase in the portfolio of the producers of validation/mining output. Note as well that the dilution effect would not be visible in the stock held by owners of existing CWLM if the accounts are denominated in CAWLM as opposed to domestic currency; this corresponds to an “exchange rate” effect that should be recorded as revaluations in the accounts denominated in CAWLM”.

- Paragraph 13.64: It is proposed to change the start of the last sentence from “Any subsequent changes will affect the liability ...” to “Subsequent changes in mortality data will affect the liability...”.

Question 2 – Is the material in the chapter clear?

No substantive issues were raised.

Two minor additional issues were raised which are considered relevant for inclusion:

- Paragraph 13.21: It is proposed to change “the area through which the fish migrate” to “the fishing ground”, as not all fish migrate. Moreover, it is proposed to further qualify the language on value being encapsulated in the quota.
- Paragraph 13.32: In view of avoiding confusion, it is proposed to add, at the end of the paragraph, a reference to chapter 27, where further explanation is provided on the treatment of leases of natural resources. In addition, it may be useful to change, in the second sentence, the reference to “natural resources” to “non-produced natural resources (e.g., land)”, and to change, in the last sentence, the reference to “certain natural resources” to “certain natural resources (e.g., mineral and energy resources)”.

Question 3 – Are there any errors in the chapter, or inconsistencies within this chapter or with other chapters?

One substantive issue was raised.

Issue 13.3.1: Paragraphs 13.26, 13.27 and 13.63 seem to be inconsistent with each other. While paragraph 13.27 states, in relation to stranded assets, that “Such downward appraisals of the value of energy resources should be recorded as revaluations, not as other changes in the volume of assets. This also holds for related downward changes in the future extraction path.”, paragraph 13.26 states that downward appraisals should generally be recorded as other changes in the volume of assets. These paragraphs seem to draw inconsistent conclusions, as stranded assets also refer to the exploitability of resources being reassessed and leading to a downward reappraisals.

Proposed response: It is proposed to align the treatment of stranded assets to the more general guidance on the recording of reappraisals. Although this would imply a deviation of the guidance provided in paragraph 74 of GN WS.9, with the benefit of hindsight it is proposed to change the guidance in view of consistency with other already existing guidance.

Three minor additional issues were raised which are considered relevant for inclusion:

- Paragraph 13.29: It is proposed to add “for a considerable period of time” at the end of the paragraph, in view of making clear that a suspension for a short period of time does not lead to the consideration of ceasing of an asset to be deployed.
- Heading above paragraph 13.20: It is proposed to change the word “uncultivated” to “non-cultivated”. In this respect, the whole 2025 SNA will need to be checked on the consistency of using the word “non-cultivated”, instead of “uncultivated”, certainly in the case of references to the terms used in the classification hierarchies. (Note: Also included in the issues note with crosscutting issues.)

- Paragraph 13.39: It is proposed to change the paragraph into the following (changes underlined): “Financial assets that are claims on other institutional units are created when the debtor accepts the obligation to make a payment, or payments, to the creditor in the future; they are extinguished when the debtor has fulfilled the obligation under the terms of the agreement. Monetary gold held in the form of gold bullion (including allocated gold accounts), however, cannot be created and extinguished in this way; hence when it becomes a reserve asset it enters the financial part of the balance sheet as a reclassification in the other changes in the volume of assets and liabilities account from valuables to monetary gold. (At the time it is acquired by a monetary authority it is first classified as a valuable.) Reclassifications are also made for unallocated gold accounts that become part of monetary gold. When unallocated gold accounts become reserve assets they are reclassified from currency and deposits to monetary gold, also in the other changes in the volume of assets and liabilities accounts. In the case monetary gold becomes subject to reverse transactions (i.e., gold swaps), and is not readily available anymore for meeting balance of payments financing needs, this is also recorded as an other change in the volume of reserve assets; see also paragraph 12.46. Monetary gold may be sold to another monetary authority but otherwise any reduction in holdings follows a similar declassification path; the monetary gold is reclassified to be either a valuable (in the case of gold bullion) or currency and deposits (in the case of unallocated gold accounts). Subsequent transactions, if and when they occur, are recorded in terms of valuables or currency and deposits and not in terms of monetary gold.”

Question 4 – Are there any other concerns?

No substantive issues were raised.

Two minor additional issues were raised which are considered relevant for inclusion:

- Paragraph 13.21: In the first sentence, it is proposed to change the reference to “the natural growth of the fish” into “the fish”. Furthermore, the language on quota will be further qualified, in line with the first bullet under question 2.
- Paragraph 13.55: In view of the having guidance which is more up-to-date, it is proposed to replace the reference “the effects of acidity in the air and acid rain” by a more general reference to “the depositions of air emissions”.

Disagreement with agreed recommendations for the update of the 2008 SNA – provided for information only

There were no recommendations regarding which five or more respondents disagreed.

Substantive concerns with 2008 SNA text unaffected by agreed recommendations – provided for information only

There were no substantial concerns regarding the 2008 SNA text unaffected by agreed recommendations.